

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7817

nautical and Space Sciences. I should like to join my colleagues there tomorrow. But I have canceled my plans to go with my committee, and to my home State, because it seems extremely important to some that this bill be considered at this particular time.

I am not in favor of any prolonged opposition to the measure. I am perfectly willing to vote, let us say, on Thursday. But I want Senators to have an opportunity to discuss the bill. I think this is the worst agricultural bill which has been before the Senate during my service in this body. It not only would adopt, as to feed grains, the Brannan program, but would do a much worse thing. It would not even limit the application of compensatory payments as they were limited under the Brannan program.

I want Senators to realize what they are being asked to do. Therefore, I hope the vote may be set at not earlier than Thursday. I am quite agreeable to give consent to a vote Thursday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the Senator has made a very reasonable request. As always, he is most gracious in his consideration of the problems of the leadership. I know he will understand when I say that I mentioned Tuesday only for bargaining purposes.

I hope to meet later in the afternoon with the distinguished minority leader and other Senators from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and perhaps reach a reasonable agreement which will give every Senator an opportunity to make his views known.

Mr. HOLLAND. I express my appreciation. I shall not object to present consideration of the measure. There will be ample opportunity to discuss it. As I say, I am strongly opposed to it. I wish to state my opposition and the reasons for it, but I understand I shall have an opportunity to do that between now and Thursday. That is why I suggest a vote on Thursday.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, I say to the majority leader very frankly that if an objection to considering the bill would postpone action on it for an indefinite time or for a substantial period of time, I would have no hesitancy about objecting. I am merely trying to be realistic when I say that an objection at the moment, at least, will not be lodged by me.

The Senator from Florida has again mentioned one very important thing. There are at least three, and perhaps four, Senators who are not on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who are vitally interested in this bill and who wish to participate in the discussion of the bill from their standpoint, who, so far as I know, have not yet had an opportunity to see the hearings or the report. On last Friday two of these Senators asked me specifically about the timing of the bill and were very much concerned about it not being acted upon finally in the early part of this week.

They were concerned to the point that they did not want it acted upon at that time.

I hope that before Senators agree to any specific time—to which I would have to object at this moment—we can be given a little time to discuss it with interested Members of the Senate who are not members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in order to get some views and try to harmonize any final agreement which the leadership may wish to propose to the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has that assurance.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Montana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader what is to happen with respect to S. 537 after the feed grain bill is disposed of.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That will be the pending business. I would hope that we would be able to consider it. There will, of course, be the conference reports on the supplemental appropriation bill and the military procurement bill in between.

Mr. MILLER. But it is the intention of the leadership to consider S. 537 and to dispose of it within a reasonable time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have only one further observation to make. The majority leader is in a position to move to set aside S. 537 and to consider the feed grains bill if he so desires. He preferred, however, to ask unanimous consent. I am quite sure that we can agree upon a timetable agreeable to all Senators, so that every Senator will have an opportunity to be heard.

FEED GRAIN ACT OF 1963

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 4997) to extend the feed grain program.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The feed grains bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I am in favor of the bill. I went along with 10 other Senators in the committee. The vote was 11 to 6 in the committee. It was not a partisan vote. At that time both Democrats and Republicans voted on both sides of the question.

It was felt in the committee that some legislation should be enacted at this time.

There is a movement on foot, of which I think Senators should be aware, that one group is trying to postpone action until after the referendum vote upon the wheat program, which is before the

farmers. I believe that vote will be on the 21st of this month.

So, if a time to vote could be arranged either Wednesday or Thursday that would be satisfactory to me, and I think it would suit most of the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I hope some agreement can be reached whereby this legislation can be expedited rather than to prolong consideration and take up time of the Senate. Every day spent on this subject will mean keeping other legislation from being considered.

For that reason I hope Senators can agree to a reasonable date on which to consider the bill and dispose of it, after Senators have had an opportunity to speak and express themselves in respect to what the bill would do for agriculture.

FREE WORLD TRADE WITH CUBA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from time to time I have been placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the number of ships from the free world which have been discharging cargoes to Communist Cuba. I have kept the Record up to date. I have today another list of ships for the period April 5 through May 8, 1963.

During the period April 5 through May 8, 1963, 20 free world freighters and tankers totaling 152,953 gross tons discharged their cargoes in Cuba. Great Britain maintained its lead in supplying Castro by providing 77,953 gross tons of the before-mentioned total. During the past 2 weeks alone five vessels flying the Lebanese flag, totaling 35,678 gross tons called in Cuba. A significant first is a Swedish freighter, the *Dagmar*, of 6,490 gross tons.

In the course of the past month through May 8, 1963 the following ships, of the free world arrived in Cuba and unloaded their cargoes. Their flag of registry and gross tonnage is as indicated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of ships may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Aithelmonarch (tanker), British, 11,192.
Avisfaith, British, 7,868.
Hazelmoor, British, 7,907.
Ho Fung, British, 7,121.
Wendover, British, 9,098.
Ardrowan, British, 7,300.
Fir Hill, British, 7,119.
Maratha Enterprise, British, 7,166.
Vercharman, British, 7,265.
Yungfutuay, British, 5,388.
Aldebaran (tanker), Greek, 12,897.
Americana, Greek, 7,104.
Galini, Greek, 7,266.
Ilena, Lebanese, 5,925.
Akamas, Lebanese, 7,285.
Atolos II, Lebanese, 7,256.
Noelle, Lebanese, 7,251.
Parmarina, Lebanese, 6,721.
St. Nicholas, Lebanese, 7,163.
Dagmar, Swedish, 6,490.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION—REMARKS BY DR. FRANK STANTON

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, ever since the Federal Communications Com-

mission reserved 242 television channels for educational purposes in 1952, this program has slowly but determinedly moved ahead. Last year, after 8 years of effort, my educational bill which would help put the many unused educational television channels on the air was enacted. A great deal still must be done and will be done before the benefits of this miraculous medium and the creation of the educational television network becomes a fact.

I was, therefore, pleased to read the remarks of Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, delivered to the CBS network affiliates on March 9, 1963, in which he devoted his entire talk to educational television. I must say that this is one of the most enlightened analysis made by a commercial broadcaster that I have had the opportunity to read. Its forthrightness as well as its farsightedness displays the type of leadership that Dr. Stanton has exercised in the field of broadcasting for so many years.

I congratulate him for this excellent presentation and commend it to my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

NINTH GENERAL CONFERENCE OF CBS TELEVISION NETWORK AFFILIATES

(By Frank Stanton, president, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.)

Once more I am very happy to welcome all of you. It is now 15 years since we first met together to discuss our common opportunities and our common problems. The mutual approach we have taken—the friendly atmosphere of openness and informality—has, I think, been extremely useful in establishing and maintaining the CBS Television Network's No. 1 position.

In 1955, when we began to refer to this annual session as a "general conference," I emphasized that our calling this gathering a conference was no accident. "Our purpose," I said at that time, "is not to invite you here for lectures; rather, the purpose is to provide means for the exchange of ideas with the central focus on perplexing problems that affect us all deeply and equally."

We have had, in the intervening years, many such discussions, and out of them have come reasoned, consistent, supportable views that have frequently been the basis for much of the progress not only we but the whole field of television have made.

It is in this spirit of friendly and frank mutual counsel that I come again to you this year, to discuss a subject that is, I believe, of deep concern to the future of all television and, perhaps, of our whole society—educational television.

At the outset, let me put unmistakably the propositions that I see as the points of departure—the minimum essentials—for our discussion:

First, educational television must not fail. Second, we in commercial television have a very real stake in its survival and success. Third, it must succeed in its broadest, not its narrowest, concept.

Fourth, it must be independent—dependent alike of subsidy by Government or subsidy by commercial television.

Although the concept of educational television is as old as television itself, as an operating branch of broadcasting it is still in its early youth, going through agonizing growing pains more frequently than not, un-

certain of itself in most ways, and attempting to solve practical problems of a very special nature that have no counterparts either in broadcasting or in education.

In 1948, when we held our first affiliates' clinic, the predecessor of these annual conferences, there were no educational television stations on the air. And it was to be 5 years—1953—before the first started operations. Today there are 79 educational stations in operation, and over 300 channels, both VHF and UHF, are reserved for educational purposes. But even this number, according to a report of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, is inadequate to meet the need if television is to be fully utilized to help solve the immense educational task facing this country for the predictable future. No less than 600 additional channels, the report stated, will be necessary.

We in commercial television know something of the problems these educational stations have, because some problems are implicit in the medium—however it is used or financed. To name a few—all too familiar to you: the enormous need for material, the great costs of production, the competent manpower required, the necessity to serve a community as a whole and not just one area of interest or just one level of education. In addition, educational television must find a means—better than improvisations—to pay its way in a society that can offer no foolproof method borrowed from a similar situation.

And the fundamental challenge to educational television is the same as the fundamental challenge to us in commercial television: to interest an audience and to hold it. We broadcasters ought not to take any satisfaction in educational television as a weak adjunct of commercial television, however true that may be today. We ought not to be content merely to support it with conscience money. We have a very real stake in its success—its success on a broad, varied scale. For what diminishes it diminishes us, in that it diminishes all television. And what strengthens it strengthens us, because it strengthens all television.

If this seems to you idle theory, think for a minute of what our society would be if we had the printing press but no textbooks, no learned quarterlies, no magazines appealing to the few, no specialized cultural publications—if the role of the printing press were limited only to the production of mass circulation magazines, however excellent. Would not all of us sense that something was wrong and feel an obligation to see that something was done about it? And would we not feel that those already using print with spectacular success had a particular concern that something be done? That it not be bucked over to the Government?

I am not just preaching benevolence here. To prove itself in our age—to advance its freedom as a mature medium—television is going to have to do, with distinction and effectiveness, all the jobs of which it is capable—not just those that we in commercial television have taken on. And the measure of the medium's total achievement will be the measure of our own freedom to do our part of the job.

If educational television is to realize its fullest potentialities, it is important that we encourage it to take the broadest and not the narrowest view of its mission, to make the most and not the least of its opportunities.

This means that, if we honestly believe in free competition, we should welcome educational television into the free competition for the viewer's attention. I discussed with you last year our conviction that the surest path to television's growth was not more Government supervision, not more industry policing, not more private pressure

groups, but more competition. I suggested to you, and I testified before the FCC, that the most sensible approach to more competition was a fuller utilization of the spectrum—UHF as well as VHF—using both bands for more stations and better, more varied service.

I remind you of this now, because it is to me overwhelmingly clear that educational television is one additional competitive factor that can give us the kind of prodding anyone needs in order to improve constantly. As you know, CBS has not arrived at this judgment lately. Over 2 years ago, on January 13, 1961, I disagreed with the president of the National Educational Television and Radio Center, in a panel discussion at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, that educational television should be only supplementary to rather than competitive with commercial television. On that occasion, I said, "I think that in the long run educational television will be a competitive service, and I think that this is desirable." In that same year, 1961, the CBS annual report included the following statement in the letter of the chairman and the president: "CBS has always had a special interest in educational television, has supported its growth, and has directly contributed to the widening of its range of activities. CBS welcomes educational television not only as supplementary to, but as competitive with, commercial television service. We believe this competition will benefit both types of service."

We did not come to that conclusion only for the good of educational television. We did not even come to it only for the good of the public that television, in order to survive, must serve. We came to it primarily for the good of all television—commercial and educational.

I am sure that you know as well as I do that the price of growth—the price, in fact, of survival—in any mass medium is change—constant, never-ceasing change. I do not know that it is always change for the better or even that it is always progressive. But change itself is the thing—never resting on your oars, never sure you have the right mix, never completely satisfied, being as willing to change when you are not entirely sure you are right as when you think it is perfectly safe. The only deadly thing for us—for any mass medium—is to stand still while the inexorable law of change is going to work all about us.

Yet we must have some sense of what we are doing, some sense of pace, some sense of direction. We are like the mass circulation magazine whose economics, audience, and fundamental editorial and advertising roles do not permit it the same freedom as the book publisher, who can survive with a much smaller audience, who has no advertising function and who needs to meet no huge economic commitments. Yet does anyone doubt that the mass printed media are much the better off because there are book publishers and publishers of little magazines, from whom flow a continuous stream of new ideas, new knowledge, new theories appealing to every size of audience, reflecting every kind of interest, representing every kind of creative approach? A great testing ground is provided by all this activity—where the unfamiliar and the unproved can be tried out in an arena in which the stakes are low enough to make such trial possible on a broad scale.

Ultimately not just the vitality of our total cultural life is quickened by this but the mass media find themselves with a twofold gain—an audience somehow aware of new things going on and an indication of what those things are and how they can be handled.

This medium of ours is not immune, and cannot be, from all the laws of survival and growth and the pressures that affect the older media. Nor are we immune from the eco-

ents recently was chosen Miss Rose Haven for 1963 at the Rose Haven Yacht Club in my home county of Anne Arundel.

The new queen is Miss Vickie Maeder, a resident of Rose Haven and a student in the 11th grade at Southern High School.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by David Kearse from the May 2 edition of the Evening Capital describing this fine occasion, in the RECORD:

YACHT CLUB PICKS NEW QUEEN

(By David Kearse)

A bevy of beautiful girls brightened up Rose Haven Yacht Club last Saturday evening as the members and guests sat around waiting for the piece de resistance of the evening: the crowning of Miss Rose Haven for 1963.

After the judges each personally had an opportunity to meet the four candidates, and after the princesses had paraded around before the judges and the audience, the queen was indeed selected, much to the delight of all who attended.

A Rose Haven girl, formerly of Chevy Chase, was selected this year's queen. She will compete for further beauty honors at Maryland Yacht Club on June 2, when the Queen of the Chesapeake will be named.

The lucky winner was Miss Vickie Maeder, an 11th grade student at Southern High School, who won the judges' fancies with her charm, poise and pleasant personality. Dressed in a white gown, the winner was presented her crown by last year's queen and this year's guest of honor, Miss Betty Sue Plummer.

The 16-year-old Miss Maeder's also received a trophy and bouquet of roses, not to mention a kiss from the yacht club's commodore, Dr. Donald W. Mitchell of Arlington, Va. The master of ceremonies for the colorful event was Vincent Scott and another Scott, this one Charles Scott, a past commodore, was chairman of the judges, who had a hard time, indeed, in selecting only one queen. All four of the girls were "winners" in the real sense of the word, if looks, grace and charm are any indication. Other contestants were Miss Bernie Raley, Miss Helen Burke, and Miss Michele Hecker.

All this reporter can say is good luck next time around, girls, for with your looks and personalities, you're all bound to come up with beauty prizes soon.

Those who attended the gala crowning ceremonies took time out to greet each other and talk over the boating world. Then, too, some of the women who had just returned from various trips had notes to compare.

For instance, Mrs. John Stoneburg ("Little Sarah"), wife of the yacht club's public relations director, just returned from a 6-month visit to California. Also, Miss Billie Kramer was kept busy telling about her exploits at the romantic locales on the Caribbean from whence she just returned.

Speaking of Stoneburg, who is better known to his friends as "Stoney," he gave this reporter a "Cook's tour" of the beautiful yacht club and its facilities, which were very impressive, indeed. He also proved to be very helpful to this reporter's cohort, Lou Granger, who took many a picture and admired many a potential beauty queen, but then, who didn't?

And Joseph E. Rose was there to take in the evening's event. Rose is builder and owner of the yacht club and its environs, which includes a nice motel next door to the main dining room and bar.

Altogether, yours truly and Granger returned from Saturday night's fun-filled evening very impressed with our visit to the yacht club and Rose Haven itself. It was our first introduction to the club and its delightful members. And congratulations to this year's queen, Miss Rose Haven.

Race to the Moon: Why Is It So Important?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 months, the House Manned Space Flight Subcommittee has been hearing testimony on the U.S. space program.

As a member of this subcommittee, I was happy to read the well-written and informative article by Roscoe Drummond in the Washington Post of May 6, 1963, entitled "Race to the Moon: Why Is It So Important?"

It points out why the United States should be foremost in outer space.

The article follows:

RACE TO THE MOON: WHY IS IT SO IMPORTANT?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The big, costly, valuable space-exploration program is running into public misgivings largely because it is so often defended for the wrong reasons.

I am convinced that when Congress almost unanimously a year ago greatly stepped up the space program and apparently set it on a course from which it was not to veer, it made the right decision. We ought to stick to it resolutely.

To make it the firm objective of the United States to be foremost in outer space does not seem to me to be a very remarkable decision. Isn't that doing what comes naturally to the American people? That's not out of character. That decision is in the national tradition—or something is very amiss.

But now there is talk about cutting back only a year after deciding to go full-steam ahead. This sort of talk sounds chicken: "Oh, what's the use? And who wants to be first anyway?"

There is danger that there will be a cut-back, a grievously mistaken cutback, if the real reasons for the space program are not better expounded.

If we keep on asking the wrong question, we are going to be stuck with the wrong answer. The tendency in defending the space budget is to stress the race to the moon and how important it is to beat the Russians. The honest question which then arises and understandably brings divided answers is: Why is it so important to be first to the moon?

The answer which many Americans tend to give is that it would be nice to beat the Russians to the moon, but that it is hardly worth \$20 billion and certainly not \$40 billion.

This is a sample of how asking the wrong question produces the wrong answer.

The controlling reason for the size of the space program is not just to try to get to the moon first—however welcome that would be—but to make sure that Americans will be foremost in mastering the new element and the new dimension of outer space.

We talk about competitive coexistence with the Communist world as the best way to win the cold war. Outer space is a vital, perhaps the crucial area of competition. The overriding issue is not who is going to be first to the moon but who is going to be foremost in mastery of the new element of outer space because the mastery of outer space will do more than anything else to determine the shape of our world for many decades, perhaps for several centuries.

There are precedents. Through their mastery of roadmanship the Romans shaped their world for a long time.

Through their mastery of seamanship the British did most to influence the affairs of the world for a century.

Through their mastery of airmanship Britain and the United States turned back the tide of Hitler and Tojo.

Through the mastery of spacemanship—through being foremost in outer space, not just first to the moon—it is now within the reach of the United States to affect greatly the shape of the world for the rest of this century and, I believe, for some centuries ahead.

I am not talking about the United States dominating the world through outer space. I am talking about the necessity of the United States being foremost in outer space so that the Soviet Union cannot dominate the world through its prior mastery of outer space.

The United States is committed to the freedom of outer space as it is to the freedom of the seas. We are prepared to undertake joint explorations with the Soviets and some are in prospect. But when it comes to deciding whether we should continue unwaveringly to mobilize full resources to be foremost in the new element and the new dimension of outer space, I commend these warning words of the Vice President of the United States:

"If we do not succeed in these efforts—as one great American has put it—we will not be first on the moon, we will not be first in space, and one day soon we will not be the first on earth."

Another View of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, there have been many comments on the Cuban situation ranging from the ridiculous to the sublime. Jim Hudson, editor-publisher of the White Mountain Eagle, an outstanding weekly newspaper in my district, has written a most thoughtful and calm appraisal of the problem which I feel warrants careful study:

THE MANY SOLUTIONS TO CUBAN PROBLEM

In the past year or so, there have been many solutions to the Cuba—or Cuber, if you will—problem, ranging from downright silly to probably workable. Which one eventually will be utilized is something we will have to wait and see.

We feel that the present administration is following a policy that will accomplish the purpose with the least amount of pain and embarrassment.

We say this because, at the current rate, it will be too expensive a toy for the Soviet Union to keep supporting. At present, the Cuban sugar crop, its only real exportable item, is at its lowest and over 90 percent has been allocated to Russia for past debts. The remainder will not be enough to buy peanuts. At least, not enough to buy vodka and caviar. Or tanks and jets and missiles.

In order for Cuba to arm, it will be necessary for the Soviet Union to foot the bill. And the Russians, big and powerful as they are, are having problems of their own.

The United States will not allow the Russians to arm Cuba again, and we will continue to keep pressure on them to remove those Soviets who are left on the island. When the cost of upkeep goes beyond the benefit, you can rest assured the Reds will drop it like a hot potato.

A2952

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 13

Once the Russians pull out, and we feel that day is not far off, that will be the day for Jose Miro Cardona and his boys to pull out all stops. And we are sure it will not be as long a fight as the July 26 movement from the Sierra Madres was.

The Nonviolent Terrorists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I think it is most appropriate today to offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a timely column by Mr. Thurman Sensing in the May 12, 1963, edition of his weekly column, Sensing the News. This particular column is entitled "The Nonviolent Terrorists" and is concerned with the racial agitation efforts by Martin Luther King and others in Birmingham, Ala. Since this column makes such an important point and is so timely, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NONVIOLENT TERRORISTS (By Thurman Sensing)

The use of schoolchildren to spearhead massive street demonstrations in a Southern city points up the increasingly revolutionary character of the agitation campaign facing this Nation.

For ordinary Americans, it is hard to believe that citizens of this country would attempt to steer a minority group away from evolutionary progress to the alien and dangerous methods of revolution. Yet the troubles in Birmingham, Ala., are proof of the emergence of revolutionary methods on the American scene. Those who have kept a watchful eye on the race agitation campaigns of the last 8 years are aware of the shift to revolutionary tactics and revolutionary aims.

The growth of the Muslim movement, clearly understood as dangerous to civil order in this country, is only the tip of the iceberg that appears above water. Indeed the menace of the Muslims may not be so considerable as some people fear, simply because they are recognized for what they are. But the various groups that profess nonviolence and use the word "Christian" in their organizational names often are shielded by their pious labels. These nonviolent groups aim at essentially the same thing however. They aim at the incitement to violence, at the stirring of civil commotion and at the breakdown of law and order in this country.

Furthermore, the threat of organized law-breaking is not confined to the Southern States. Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL threatens the District of Columbia with the worst race riot in history if the authorities do not submit to the demands of the Negroes. Northern communities have been subjected to mass agitation techniques with increasing frequency in the last few years. Moreover, the groups that aim at radical revision of social customs in the South are closely related to groups in the North that protest national defense measures, such as testing of nuclear weapons. So-called nonviolent groups that send agitators into the Southern States also have their

people protesting against Polaris submarines in the North. There is an interlocking directorate of radicalism that should be thoroughly investigated by law-enforcement agencies in this country.

The terrible H-bomb riots in London, with the waves of political beatniks, should alert American authorities to what they face from the growth of the professional sit-in organizations. The agitators who plan a kneel-in in a Southern church may turn next to an invasion of a missile test center in California or a naval base in Connecticut.

It is not by some freak of behavior that the agitators in Birmingham resort to civil disobedience methods that are alien. Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., who has planned these campaigns, is a senior official of the Ghandi Society. This organization, named after the Indian civil disobedience leader, approaches American domestic problems from the standpoint of an Asiatic agitator group. These new agitators seek to create human waves of demonstrators. They want to ride roughshod over all local and State laws.

But the only form of social protest that American communities can properly accept is demand for justice in the courts. This is the sole, truly American way to accomplish change, except by legislative action. But when a mass agitation leader and his high-powered organization turns to the use of mobs, then you know such action is against everything America stands for.

People in all parts of the United States ought to be deeply concerned by the rise of un-American methods of agitation. The goal is the breakdown of law enforcement. The agitators, many of them wearing clerical collars, set an example of lawlessness to thousands of impressionable youths with little learning and less judgment. The result of such demonstrations, as Martin Luther King led in Birmingham, is the rise of a class of terrorists who have nothing but contempt for the American Government. If youths are taught to be contemptuous of law made by city councils and State governments, it is only a short step to be contemptuous of law made by Congress.

The sowing of dissension in America can profit only one cause—the cause of international communism. Demonstrations against the public order of our cities can only be pleasing to the masters of the Kremlin who want to destroy America from within by dividing the country and encouraging lawlessness. The United States cannot afford to have phony nonviolent groups that masquerade behind the word "Christian" and that promote violence and fan the flames of hatred.

The ordeal imposed upon Birmingham, Ala., Albany, Ga., and other communities is an attack on America itself. The need is for the entire Nation to become alerted to the development of terrorism inside the United States by those who profess to be interested in progress but who only spread disorder.

The Brotherhood of the Jungle Cock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on the banks of Big Hunting Creek, in the town of Thurmont, Md., is a beautiful bronze statue of a man teaching a young boy how to properly cast for trout. This statue was dedicated a few years ago by

Justice William O. Douglas, of the Supreme Court, one of our great outdoorsmen. The statue was designed and erected by one of our outstanding sportsmen's organizations, the Brotherhood of the Jungle Cock.

The brotherhood was organized 25 years ago in the Catoctin area of Maryland not far from where the statue stands. Its founders were a few of the great sportswriters of the country who saw a growing need for teaching our youth how to preserve the beauty of the out-of-doors and the great fun of fishing. The jungle cock is a beautiful and fearless bird found only in the jungles of South America whose feathers make the most attractive artificial flies used in fishing.

Each year, around the 1st of May, members of the Brotherhood of the Jungle Cock gather from many States to the beautiful area in Maryland where the idea was first born for their annual campfire. No man may attend without bringing him one or more boys—and he must be responsible for teaching and coaching them during the 3 days of the meeting.

This year the campfire was held on the 3d, 4th, and 5th of May. About 400 attended.

I want to extend to this fine organization my compliments and congratulate the dedicated men who, without publicity, have worked so hard to preserve for later generations the benefits of nature's bounty. May they continue to grow and may their efforts be rewarded. We should all be proud that one of our own Senate employees, Mr. Serge N. Benson, is president of the Brotherhood of the Jungle Cock.

I ask unanimous consent that the creed of the brotherhood, together with the program of activities at this year's campfire, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the creed and program were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CREED

We, who love angling, in order that it may enjoy practice and reward in the later generations, mutually move together toward a common goal—the conservation and restoration of American game fishes.

Toward this end we pledge that our creel limits shall always be less than the legal restrictions and always well within the bounty of nature herself.

Enjoying, as we do, only a life estate in the out-of-doors, and morally charged in our time with the responsibility of handing it down unspoiled to tomorrow's inheritors, we individually undertake annually to take at least one boy fishing, instructing him, as best we know, in the responsibilities that are soon to be wholly his.

Holding that moral law transcends the legal statutes, always beyond the needs of any one man, and holding that example alone is the one certain teacher, we pledge always to conduct ourselves in such fashion on the stream as to make safe for others the heritage which is ours and theirs.

PROGRAM

FRIDAY, MAY 3, AFTERNOON

1. Register, go to office at rear of dining room. Get cabin assignment and name card.
2. Go fishing if you have time. Casting lesson at the pond at 4 p.m. Be back at camp

1963

A2947

the claimants, and wrote Mr. Delgado on February 9, 1962 (hearing, p. 179):

"It is regrettable that we did not make up this list before we left the Commission, but this is little solace now."

3. The testimony before the Senate investigation showed that Mr. O'Donnell, Mr. Delgado, and Mr. Schein spearheaded the testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee in support of the claims legislation without disclosing their strong private interest in it.

The testimony showed that a crucial issue in the consideration of this legislation was as to the meaning and intent of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946; that the testimony of these three men was accepted as coming from men who were experts on that subject due to their work with the Commission; that they had already received large legal fees as a result of other Philippine war damage legislation, and would receive additional large fees if the 1962 act were passed in the form which they desired; namely, with provision for payments to private claimants; that the Foreign Affairs Committee reported favorably a bill in that form on June 27, 1960, despite the fact that the then administration had recommended settlement of Philippine war damage claims with the Philippine Government by a lump-sum payment to that Government.

That bill, H.R. 12078, 86th Congress, 2d session, died in the Rules Committee. In the 87th Congress a similar bill, H.R. 8617, was reported favorably in August 1961, and was defeated in the House May 9, 1962, on a rollcall vote of 201 to 171. Another similar bill, H.R. 11721, was immediately filed, was passed by the House on August 1, 1962, by the Senate on August 24, 1962, and became Public Law 87-616.

During the debate in the Senate on May 1, 1963, Senator HICKENLOOPER suggested an explanation as to why the House chose to support a bill for payment to claimants rather than to the Philippine Government, saying (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7162):

"A bill providing payment to the Philippine Government was ruled out in the other body. No one knew quite why.

"The information that I am about to mention is not yet in the RECORD, but I assure Senators that there is ample reason to know that word went from powerful Members of the other body that unless the State Department and the administration accepted the bill as it was altered to make the \$73 million payments to individual claimants rather than to the Philippine Government, there would be no bill at all, and the international complications that had arisen as the result of the failure to pass the original bill in the House would continue."

Comments by Senator FULBRIGHT were (hearing, p. 261):

"Mr. O'Donnell testified before this committee that he did not disclose, in previous testimony before the Congress, that he was acting in fact, if not in law, as the agent of foreign principals, and for his own interests. He spoke as a former official of the Federal Government whose interest was in having that Government pay purportedly legitimate claims. In fact, he was bound to be at least partially motivated by his own financial interest.

"The primary purpose of this investigation, of which today's hearing was a part, is to examine into the terms and the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act. Today's hearing I think has disclosed significant weaknesses, to the extent that Congress, the State Department, and the Justice Department did not know that a powerful moving force behind the passage of the Philippine War Damage Claims Legislation Act of 1962 was private gain rather than public welfare or national security.

"That they (Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Delgado) have been unduly enriched is of less importance than that the legislative process has been subverted. Both Congress and the Executive were, I believe, deceived."

During the debate in the Senate on May 1, 1963, Senator HICKENLOOPER said (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7163):

"This is a flagrant case. It is a flagrant case of * * * deliberate withholding of personal interest by witnesses before committees of the Congress, which amounts to complete deception.

"They were out drumming up business by international cable, letter, and other contacts to solicit the claims of these people. Then they got busy and stirred up the idea that the United States might be induced to put up \$73 million for rehabilitation purposes, but their purpose was to pay it to individuals on individual claims, because they were developing contracts with the individual claimants, and those contracts have been listed in the RECORD. They used a substantial amount of money * * *. One of these men came before the committees of the House and Senate, presenting himself as a former member of the Philippine War Damage Commission, and therefore connoting that he was in a special position of sympathy for and knowledge of the poor people in the Philippines—and many of them did suffer—but he never once disclosed that he was a lobbyist who had solicited business for revenue, based upon his service in the Government. * * *. He never disclosed his own personal interest in this subject or his own pecuniary interest, or that of his fellow member on the Commission who was equally busy in the Philippines soliciting these claims.

"This was a racket, and a concealed racket. The administration did not know it. It was not revealed until almost collaterally and incidentally to a broader investigation by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations."

II

The House should concur with the Senate amendment

The House was subjected to the same pressures and deceptions as the Senate. The House should conclude, as did Members of the Senate, that, had it known the facts which have since been disclosed, it would not have passed the 1962 act in the form in which it was passed. It should decide that the best way to correct the situation is to change the 1962 act by amendment into the form providing for payment directly to the Philippine Government.

The House has had grave doubts as to making further payments to private claimants. It defeated one bill for that purpose May 9, 1962, by a record vote of 201 to 171. It certainly would not have subsequently passed another similar bill had it known the facts which have since been disclosed.

If it did not pass that form of bill, it would have passed a bill providing for payment to the Philippine Government, as the previous administration had virtually promised such a settlement, and had recommended it to the Congress.

In 1959 the United States negotiated settlement of 19 outstanding Philippine claims, one of which was for additional war damages. In a note of August 4, 1959, to the Philippine Government, under the salutation, "Excellency," it said (Foreign Relations Committee hearing, June 12, 1962, p. 20):

"With respect to the Philippine claim for payment of additional war damage compensation in accordance with the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (Public Law 370, 79th Cong.) the executive branch of the U.S. Government will at the next regular session of the Congress, and in connection with the legislative program for fiscal year 1961, request appropriate legislation enabling the settlement of this matter on the basis of

\$73 million, which amount reflects the statutory maximum of unpaid private claims according to the reports of the War Damage Commission. By a settlement, made directly with the Philippine Government, the U.S. Government will consider itself completely divested of all responsibility for payment of individual private claims. A memorandum showing the computation of the amount unpaid under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act is enclosed. No further request of the U.S. Government relating to war damage compensation will be entertained other than to supply any records which might be appropriate and be needed by the Philippine Government."

The House should now concur in the Senate amendment which would bring about settlement in that manner—by payment to the Philippine Government.

1. It is not enough merely to attempt to cut off further fees to the lobbyists.

That probably cannot be done effectively, anyway. The right objective is to undo the effect of the improper practices and deceptions which led to passage of a bill for payment to claimants which would not have been passed had the deceptions been known.

Senator SPARKMAN, who presided at the Senate hearings on the legislation said:

"I would not have voted for that bill. I would have voted for the bill which would have provided payments directly to the Philippine Government."

The proper corrective measure is to amend the 1962 act so that it will provide for payment directly to the Philippine Government.

2. Settlement by payment to the Philippine Government is acceptable to that Government.

Under Secretary Harriman told the Foreign Relations Committee, with reference to two bills: one for payment to the Philippine Government, and one for payment to private claimants (hearing, June 12, 1962, p. 14):

"The (Philippine) Government itself has stated that it will accept either bill with good will."

3. Settlement by payment to the Philippine Government would carry out the purposes of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 better than would further payments at this late date to private claimants.

The main purpose of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 was to rehabilitate the war-torn economy of the Philippines. Payment of private claims for war damages (whether caused by the United States or not) was chosen as a means to get the money quickly into the stream of the Philippine economy. The money had to be spent, or have been spent, for replacement and repair of the damages.

The 1962 act contains a similar requirement, but over \$30 million will go to 287 claimants who have large claims of \$25,000 and over (hearings, Foreign Relations Committee, June 12, 1962, p. 4). It is clear that most of them will long ago have made the replacements and repairs, so that the new payments will be windfalls.

Payment to the Philippine Government on the other hand would be a direct help to the Philippine economy, and so more in keeping with the purpose of the 1946 act.

4. The claimed saving to the United States as a result of paying private claimants is far outweighed by other considerations.

The 1962 act appropriated about \$73 million for payment of private claims, with a provision that any amounts left over after such payments would revert to the U.S. Treasury. If settlement of the war damage claims issue were made by payment to the Philippine Government, the money would all be used for such payment.

Those who favor payment to private claimants make much of the possible saving resulting from lost claims caused by disappearance of claimants, etc.

But even if a few more million dollars might go to the Philippine Government, if payment were made to it, than would go to private claimants, that fact assumes slight importance when it is recalled that since 1946 the United States has furnished over a billion dollars of aid to the Philippines and is still furnishing aid in large amounts.

That fact is far outweighed by the consideration that payments now to private claimants would in many cases be windfalls, whereas payments to the Philippine Government would carry out the purpose of the 1946 act of aiding the Philippine economy. Under the Senate amendment providing for payment to the Philippine Government, that Government would be free to use the money for rehabilitation or in such manner as it saw fit.

Fifth, if the House would not have passed the 1962 act had it known the facts recently disclosed, it should now change the form of that act to provide payment to the Philippine Government rather than to private claimants.

Those who oppose the Senate amendment argue that the 1962 act should not be changed merely because of some wrongful lobbying. Other lobbyists, they say, have made campaign contributions and been active in sponsoring legislation. The newspapers have made much of campaign contributions, which make good stories, but it is clear that what moved the Senate to conclude that it would not have passed the 1962 act had it known the facts recently disclosed was mainly based on other considerations: with Mr. O'Donnell's and Mr. Delgado's activities in promoting a demand for war claims legislation, both here and in the Philippines; with their employment on claims legislation shortly after leaving the Commission; with their spearheading of testimony before the Congress favorable to that legislation without disclosing their private interest; and with their efforts to shape the legislation in such a way that it went to individual claimants, resulting in the lobbyists' private gain, rather than to the Philippine Government—in short, with improper pressures and deceptions which led Senator HICKENLOOPER to say, "The situation stinks" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7163).

III

Background facts as to opposition to further payments of private claims

The previous administration strongly opposed further payments to private claimants at this late date, and the House defeated one bill for that purpose.

The crucial issue was as to the alleged moral obligation to make such further payments. The disclosures in the Senate investigation have cast doubt on previous testimony on this issue, much of which came from the three lobbyists mentioned above. They even claimed that a "promise" had been made for further payments, and that such payments were a "debt."

In other respects, arguments previously made against further payments to private claimants have been strengthened and justified by the recent disclosures.

Those arguments were—

1. The private claims being brought forward were not "war damage claims" in the generally accepted sense of those words (which refer to claims based on legal liability—but were based on voluntary gifts made by the United States to rehabilitate the Philippine economy).

2. The real purpose of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 was rehabilitation, and payment to private claimants was a vehicle to accomplish that purpose. The report of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on that act stated:

"The bill is not a private claims measure to reimburse individuals or organizations for damage incurred in war. The primary

function of the payments is to assist and encourage rehabilitation and rebuilding of the economy and social structure of the nation."

3. Further payment of private claims would not accomplish the main purpose of the 1946 act. The Bell Mission to the Philippines of 1950 reported (Foreign Affairs Committee Supplemental hearings on June 9, 1960, p. 21):

"That further war damage payments to individuals would not contribute materially to economic development in the Philippines, and that continuing assistance by the United States should be for development projects in agriculture and industry related to the specific needs of the Philippine economy rather than as additional war damage payments to individuals."

Since then over \$1 billion of U.S. aid has gone to the Philippines.

On March 3, 1960, Mr. Douglas Dillon, Acting Secretary of State, wrote to the Speaker of the House:

"The executive branch believes that rebuilding, replacement, or repair of war-damaged private property in the Philippines is no longer practicable. Moreover, in view of the time which has elapsed since the original claims were approved, and since the U.S. Philippine War Damage Commission went out of existence on March 31, 1951, it is not considered practicable for the U.S. Government to assume any responsibility for the payment of the balance of approved individual private property claims."

4. The Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 did not create an obligation for further payments of private claims beyond the \$400 million then provided.

This was the crucial issue. The 1946 act provided \$400 million for payment of private claims. It contained a provision that the balance of the money left after the payment of small claims in full should be used toward payment of certain other claims up to a maximum of 75 percent. The \$400 million was insufficient to pay that maximum.

Proponents of the 1962 act claimed that these provisions indicated an obligation to pay up to 75 percent. Opponents maintained that the intent of the 1946 act was to set up a method of disbursing \$400 million, and not a method of paying claims up to 75 percent.

The record of hearings, reports, and debates relative to the 1946 act can fairly be said to show that a majority of the members of the committees in both branches did not intend to create a further obligation beyond the \$400 million authorized although a few committee members insisted that the intent was to pay up to 75 percent.

CONCLUSION

The only record House vote on this legislation was against further payments to private claimants, a vote of 201 to 171 on May 9, 1962 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7349). Since the recent disclosures in the Senate investigation, there are strong additional reasons for standing back of that vote, and for voting to concur in the Senate amendment.

H. R. GROSS.

WAYNE L. HAYS.

ROBERT R. BARRY.

Cold War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution which was unanimously adopted by the AMVETS National Executive Committee in April, 1963.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas American servicemen are daily risking life and limb on numerous cold war fronts throughout the world; and

Whereas in many instances the service performed by the men serving in these cold war areas is more hazardous than that performed by many wartime veterans; and

Whereas S. 1011 introduced in the Senate of the United States recognizes the hazardous nature of this service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That AMVETS National Executive Committee assembled in Washington, D.C., at the Mayflower Hotel, April 5 through 7, 1963, support S. 1011, a bill to provide wartime benefits to veterans and their dependents who serve in an area designated by the President as an area of hostilities during the period of hostilities.

Cuba file
Bay of Pigs Survivors Get New Ultimatum on Invasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the secrecy which still surrounds the Bay of Pigs invasion, it seems to me important that the article by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott on this subject be brought to the attention of every Member of Congress.

The article appeared in the Arlington Northern Virginia Sun on May 8, 1963:

ALLEN-SCOTT REPORT—BAY OF PIGS SURVIVORS GET NEW ULTIMATUM ON INVASION
(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

The heroic survivors of the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion are faced with a crushing new ultimatum.

This latest "surrender" demand, as the Cuban veterans bitterly call it, is from the Kennedy administration in the form of a blunt order to completely refrain from having anything to do with attacks against Castro's Communist regime.

Penalty for disregarding this secret edict is immediate loss of the monthly payments they are receiving from the Government.

This harsh crackdown is being explained individually to every member of the Cuban brigade by representatives of Attorney General Robert Kennedy. These officials are conveying their orders orally and with no one present other than the freedom fighter hearing them.

Word of this extraordinary backstage development has reached the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee investigating the administration's failure to get the thousands of Russian troops out of Cuba.

One letter sent the Senators recounts in detail how the invasion veterans are summoned and singly informed that their monthly allowances, ranging from \$100 to \$250, will be discontinued unless a categorical pledge of "no action" against Castro is given. If an exile balks, his name is forthwith stricken from the payroll.

Significantly, this ironhanded undercover pressure is being exerted on brigade mem-

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2949

bers at the very time Attorney General Kennedy is publicly calling for unification of Cuban refugees in an organization that "could speak with one voice and have some relationship" with the United States and other countries.

Congressional sources close to the White House are saying privately that the Attorney General is spearheading a drive inside the administration to set up a new Cuban "front" under the leadership of Manuel Ray, member of the first Castro cabinet.

Also that only exile groups willing to go along with the President's "let the dust settle" policy are being asked to join this new organization and hold key posts in it.

Main purpose of the new "front" is described as aimed at expanding "contacts" with the Cuban underground which is to receive some financing as long as its operations remain secret. However, the organization will be barred from conducting raids or attacks on Cuba or Russians stationed there.

The administration's action in cutting off the \$81,000-a-month allowance to the Cuban Revolutionary Council is part of this unannounced new policy.

Meanwhile, Russia is taking full advantage of the protection the United States is giving its shipping to Cuba. More than a score of Soviet freighters unloaded cargoes in Cuban ports in April.

At least half of these Communist vessels sailed through the Panama Canal, raising speculation among intelligence authorities that Russian may be opening a new Cuban supply route from Vladivostok.

Until last month most of the Red ships came from either Russian ports on the Black Sea or Baltic Sea ports of the satellites.

Military experts estimate that more than half of the Soviet ships are being used to rotate and supply Russian troops in Cuba. Latest estimate of the number of these forces is being revised upward by the Defense Intelligence Agency.

The Anti-Southern Prejudice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Columbia Record, of Columbia, S.C., is recognized in South Carolina and throughout the Southeast for its consistently outstanding editorial page, and I have likewise been impressed with the editorial page of this splendid newspaper. In the May 8, 1963, edition of the Columbia Record, my attention has been called to an excellent editorial entitled "The Anti-Southern Prejudice." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE ANTI-SOUTHERN PREJUDICE

One of the Nation's most extensive, pervasive prejudices, antisouthernism, continues to be neglected by behavioral science. Yet the evidences of the syndrome mount daily in the utterances of national leaders and in the publications of the mass communications media.

If social science is truly not "a scholarly arcanum, but an organized part of the cul-

ture which exists to help man in continually understanding and rebuilding his culture," then social sciences must explore the prejudice as a preview to understanding.

They must codify and relate the sociology of antisouthernism through American history and the sociology of modern antisouthernism. Its origin, religious and political aspects, economic influences and future must be adequately researched.

The urgent necessity for such a study is brought to mind by three recent stories, two from this country and one from Britain. Each, in its way, is exemplary of antisouthernism.

In a recent editorial, the influential New York Times concluded that emerging Republicans in the South were trying to "out-segregate" Democrats, in complete disregard of the facts. Motivating the Times was the prejudicial belief that all changes in Southern political thought must be intimately involved with the racial question. The Times ignored the basic truth that the South no longer continues to be a political whole and that, in the majority of the States of the old Confederacy, race has ceased to be the major issue.

Republicanism in the South has grown because of the party's appeal to economic conservatism, the necessity for a two-party system, and the enduring dialog over Federal-State-individual relations.

The second item, a story out of London, related that the most controversial show in British television history, "That Was the Week That Was," was going off the air for the summer.

"The bitterest episode" of the BBC series, an account read, "centered on the murder of William Moore, the Baltimore postman shot in Mississippi during a protest march against racial discrimination. In the best minstrel tradition, Millicent Martin, the show's singing star, and a blackfaced chorus, asked to go back to Mississippi, 'where the Mississippi mud mingles with the blood of niggers hanging from the branches of the trees.'"

Here is the anti-South prejudice working at its worst. In the first place, the tragic and deplorable murder of the postman took place not in Mississippi, but in Alabama.

Why, then, did the show err in placing the even in Mississippi? Because, in its propaganda, the Communists have consistently singled out Mississippi as a specific example of southern race relations and because of the recent collision on the Ole Miss campus.

Social scientists should not overlook the countless cartoons of "niggers hanging from the branches of the trees" in Mississippi as pictorial summaries of white-Negro relations in the entire South.

The third item is one of the cover stories of the May 21 issue of Look magazine. On the cover, the reader is asked to inspect "The South's War Against Negro Votes," beginning on page 38.

If one reads the article, he'll find that the story involves only the State of Mississippi and not the entire South, as is alleged by the title. (Southwestern Georgia is mentioned only incidentally.) Despite the fact that South Carolina, and most of the rest of the section, insists upon no discrimination in voter registration and subsequent balloting, the entire South stands condemned by the article and its title.

Nowhere does the author even suggest to the readers that Negro registration and voting rights are being vigorously protected in Florida, Virginia, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Arkansas, Oklahoma, or North Carolina.

The antisouthern prejudice demands that the entire section be condemned.

Antisouthernism is not compatible with American democracy or Western culture. One should hope that its definition and eradication would come swiftly.

A Hospital in Haiti

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, in view of the current events in Haiti, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "A Hospital in Haiti" by Mr. Clayton Willis.

The article was published in the March 14, 1963, issue of the Fauquier Democrat, of Warrenton, Va. Mr. Willis is a reporter for the paper, and news director for radio station WEER, also in Warrenton.

This well-written article describes the fine work of Dr. William Larimer Mellon, Jr., and Mrs. Mellon, at the Albert Schweitzer Hospital at Deschappelles, about 85 miles from Port-au-Prince in Haiti, which Dr. Mellon founded and operates.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A HOSPITAL IN HAITI

(By Clayton Willis)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Clayton Willis has visited Haiti five times. A former Newsweek staff writer, he has traveled throughout Latin America, visiting every country in the Western Hemisphere. He speaks French and Spanish fluently. This is the story of the Albert Schweitzer Hospital in Haiti and the man who built it, Dr. William Larimer Mellon, Jr.)

PORT-AU-PRINCE, HAITI.—One of the most amazing hospitals anywhere is the Albert Schweitzer Hospital. It is located in the disease ridden, poverty stricken Artibonite Valley of Haiti.

I went through the beautifully equipped, one-story glass and stone building with Dr. William Larimer Mellon, Jr., a quiet, dedicated man who built the hospital in the sun parched valley in 1956. Dr. Mellon is a cousin of Paul Mellon of Upperville.

The site of the Albert Schweitzer Hospital is about 85 miles from Haiti's capital city of Port-au-Prince and about midway between this city and Cap Haitien, the country's second city.

Except for witch doctors, 52-year-old Larimer Mellon is reported to have been the first regular full-time physician in the densely populated valley.

I saw 10 tiny babies with lockjaw in 1 room of the hospital. A Haitian nurse picked up one of them. It was as stiff as a board. Dr. Mellon said the unknowing mothers use mud packs as antiseptics on the umbilical cords of the babies after birth. Mellon told me that two-thirds of the babies leave the hospital cured. The others just don't make it.

Since most of the patients can't read and write (about 10 percent are literate in Haiti), Dr. Mellon has the signs marking the examination rooms of his hospital painted different colors. He explained that the patient is told to go to a certain colored sign, not to the pediatrics department, because he can't read the word "pediatrics."

The Albert Schweitzer Hospital at Deschappelles, Haiti, asks patients to pay if they can. If they can't, Mellon reaches into his pocket and foots the bill. He has done

A2950

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 13

this so much, in fact, that Mellon has had to have outside help. The Grant Foundation of Pittsburgh, Pa., is a big backer. Public contributions supply the rest.

But, Haiti needs more than a hospital. So, Larry and his wife, Gwen, started teaching English and vocational skills in addition to the work they did in community development. Mellon and his wife, both members of the Disciples of Christ, arranged for religious activities at the hospital. The community development projects stemming from the hospital extend for a 40-mile radius. These include desperately needed schools.

To boot, the hospital has a veterinary shop. In it the burros (the Haitian ambulance in that part of the country) that bring patients are treated. Mellon noted that each burro's saddle is removed when he arrives so that his back can be checked.

Dr. Mellon has made many sacrifices to take on his Nobel Prize caliber work in Haiti. A grand nephew of the late financier, Andrew Mellon, Larimer Mellon in 1947 left a comparatively easy ranch life in Arizona to go to primitive Haiti. His wife Gwen became so ill before Christmas that she had to spend some weeks in a New York hospital getting over a mysterious disease. Mrs. Mellon has resumed her work at the hospital on a part-time basis.

As we were going through the airy building together, I said to the doctor what a wonderful job he had done with his hospital. Humble, soft-spoken Dr. Mellon replied: "I'd like to see 10 more like it in Haiti."

Roy L. Whitman

SPEECH
OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, our good friend Roy L. Whitman, Official Reporter of Debates, served his last day in the House on April 30. I join his many friends in paying tribute to the dean of its Reporters.

His magic pen has moved steadily throughout these many years—since 1932—linking the history of the House in debate and recording for all time the business of the greatest deliberative body in the world.

Only an individual of great patience, alert dexterity of hand and finite mind could have survived those many years of trying experiences—noting the ravings of fork tongued orators whose fiery words spilled in multisyllabic phrases that would deaden the blast of a French horn and stultify the mind of even Noah Webster, the ruler of the world of words.

But perhaps the antidote was at hand in the soothing gentleness of the melodious voices of the orators of yesteryear. Their sweet-sounding phrases from melliferous lips must have had a soothing effect on an authority in grammatical instruction like Roy, who revered spiced descriptions of heavenly thoughts as a cultural contribution to the beauty of the language.

Roy was very cooperative in solving the many problems brought to him for solution by Members of the House. He was unselfish and obliging in the correction of statements attributed to the

contributor on the floor. He was zealous in calling attention to a slip of the tongue in debate.

His long and varied experience in his profession (over 51 years) established him as an authority.

His long service in the "Cave of the Winds"—enduring the stunning babble of ear-splitting voices and straining for the whispering inaudible nothings of ill-prepared readings earned for him his full retirement. He and his darling wife, Eric, who also was his helpmate in his professional life are deserving of this new happiness—a healthy and permanent vacation. May the blessings of God and well wishes of the Nation keep them with one another and their love of family for many years.

Pentagon Budgeteering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I submit herewith for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article from the pen of Neal Stanford entitled "Pentagon Budgeteering," which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, May 4, 1963:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 4, 1963]

PENTAGON BUDGETEERING

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—Something quite unusual, if not unique, is happening in the Pentagon. For the first time that newsmen can recall, the military brass and the civilian chiefs in drawing up a new defense budget practically see eye to eye at the start.

The budget in question is that for fiscal year 1965, which does not really take shape until next December.

But every year about this time the military chiefs start planning for what they want in the next budget, and since billions are involved it takes not weeks but months to get it all down on paper in final form.

Actually the description seeing "eye to eye" is only figurative. For in the first "go-around" on the 1965 budget now underway the military and civilian bosses in the Pentagon were \$2 billion apart.

That \$2 billion is hardly peanuts—except by comparison.

As Defense Secretary Robert McNamara told the newspaper editors here last week, it was quite a different story a year ago.

Then, in preparing for the fiscal 1964 budget the three military departments came up with requests for over \$67 billion for defense.

After Secretary McNamara and his civilian aids got through with that massive military blueprint they had cut it down to nearly \$54 billion.

In other words the difference last year in these first estimates was over \$13 billion.

Actually the \$54 billion was still \$2 billion more than the then current defense budget, though \$10 billion more than when Mr. McNamara took over in the Pentagon.

There are a number of explanations why initial expenditure estimates drawn up a year ago by the civilian and military chiefs differed by \$13 billion and those drawn up

this spring showed only a \$2 billion difference.

The two most obvious are: Secretary of Defense McNamara and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Maxwell Taylor.

The service chiefs have had 2 years of learning Secretary McNamara's ways of doing business. They have faced up to his insistence on dollar economy in military planning. They have learned through the innumerable studies he has ordered them to make on weapons costs, manpower needs, strategic concepts, what he expects of them. Presumably, they have adjusted their thinking to his concepts.

Then, Gen. Maxwell Taylor has become Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

General Taylor is an able, articulate, experienced military officer. He has greater prestige than his immediate predecessors. He did not become Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff by moving up from the job of chief of staff of one of the services (the Army, in his case) but by stepping down from his White House post as special military adviser to the President. (Actually he had earlier retired from the job of Chief of Staff of the Army over differences with President Eisenhower.)

It is no secret that it is General Taylor's view that a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be more than Chairman in name. Some people have said he must have knocked a few heads together to get such near unanimity so early among the service chiefs as to defense needs for fiscal 1965.

A more reasonable explanation is that by his power of persuasion and his skill and knowledge in military matters he convinced his colleagues that it would be smarter for them to tailor their requests to more nearly what they might get than to let the civilians do it.

There are, of course, other explanations of this unusual situation so early in the defense budget-making picture.

One is the fact that some costly weapons systems programs now in process have passed their peak in cost requirements. Another is that new weapons systems are being explored more fully in the research and development stage rather than being rushed into production.

One example Secretary McNamara cites of money down the drain was development of the atomic airplane, on which \$1 billion was spent before it was washed out. Research should have shown up its defects before development got underway.

A third is service agreement on military planning, on joint procurement of many items. With the Army planning on a long war of attrition and the Air Force on a short war of nuclear bombardment, it was inevitable that military demands from the services would be chaotic and conflicting.

The result of all this is little short of astonishing. Rather than the civilian and military chiefs starting some \$13 billion apart in defense concepts, as they did last year, they are starting this year only \$2 billion apart.

By next December they should really be seeing eye to eye, or should one say "eyeball to eyeball"?

Rose Haven Queen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to announce to my colleagues that one of my constitu-

ning in their favor. A member of the English Fabian Socialist Society has written, "Of course, we don't want a Russian victory—but we don't want an American victory either."

They see their Utopian dream coming true through the efforts of Americans who only advocate the liberal welfare philosophy. Now let me make it plain—I don't think the overwhelming majority of liberals would knowingly support a socialist or Communist takeover. I believe they are sincere, patriotic and motivated by the most humanitarian ideals. It would be immoral and foolish to infer otherwise. But it would be equally foolish to let them have their way without opposition. If someone is setting fire to the house it doesn't make much difference whether he is a deliberate arsonist or just being careless with matches—the end result is the same.

Plutarch said, "The real destroyer of the liberties of the people is he who spreads among them bounties, donations and benefits." Thomas Jefferson predicted future happiness for the people if, "We can prevent government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of taking care of them."

Those who see only government as an answer to human misery, should ask themselves, what happens to freedom when the executive branch of government can use the power granted it by the people, and the tax money collected from the people, to coerce the people. Government tends to grow. Government programs take on a weight and momentum of their own, and they assume an immortality that gives the life beyond the duration of the emergency that brought them into being. We see today a permanent structure of government so big and complex it is almost beyond comprehension and beyond the control of Congress.

The Rural Electrification Administration is an example of this seeming immortality. Twenty-five years ago to live on a farm was to be without the advantage of electricity. The Rural Electrification Administration was created and, together with public and investor owned utilities, it has brought about the almost complete distribution of electricity to rural areas. Ninety-eight percent of the farms in America have power. But Rural Electrification Administration does not go into retirement or even settle back to a minor role of supervision now that the job has been accomplished. This year its budget went up another \$170 million to almost a half billion per year.

Our government today is engaged in operating and running more than 17,500 businesses covering 47 different lines of activity. These businesses operate tax free, rent free and dividend free. They compete openly with our taxpaying citizens and in the process, each year, they lose almost as many billions of dollars as are collected by the Federal Government from all of the personal income tax.

But some tell us that Government spending is a necessity. That in this near theory of Government it is Government spending that stimulates the economy and brings about growth and prosperity. Well, let's take a look at some of this Government spending and what a stimulant it has been. There has been no greater spending in any single area of the United States than has been done over the last couple of decades by TVA—The Tennessee Valley Authority—the great power trust of our Government. And yet in the 169 counties of that area, in spite of all this spending, the Labor Department declares that 50 percent of those counties are permanent areas of poverty, distress and unemployment.

There are today over 2½ million Federal employees. In 1942 there was 1 top-salaried executive among them for every 89 Govern-

ment employees. Today there is 1 for every 17. Now I don't mean that this should be taken as a blanket indictment of all those who serve the public in positions of Government trust. As a matter of fact, the many fine public servants employed at all levels of Government are the first to suffer from this unwarranted growth of Government. All too often they're denied a fair return for their labor because of the necessity of sharing public funds with needless employees, with duplication and with waste.

Secretary of Commerce Hodges recently received front-page attention when he said that he could run the Department of Commerce with 10 percent fewer employees than were now in that Department. And 1 month later he'd added 1,600 new employees.

At this moment for every six people earning a living in the United States, one is employed by Government. Every five of us earning a living are paying the full salary of a sixth employee. Today there are 48 million Americans receiving some direct cash payment from Government and 38 million of these are receiving it from the Federal Government. Federal welfare spending in the last 10 years has multiplied and increased eight times as much as the increase in population. Now, in the District of Columbia, in the shadow of the Capitol, they are investigating the recipients of public welfare. Of the people interviewed so far, 58 percent have been found to be receiving public welfare dishonestly.

Cuba file
American People Paying for Castro Buildup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the no-policy of the Kennedy administration, the taxpayers of the United States are pouring billions of dollars into our defenses against communism and at the same time, through the U.N., we are pouring millions into helping to strengthen the Communists. The following editorial from the Chicago Tribune, May 13, reminds us "we are the suckers" in the worldwide shell game:

U.N. SUBSIDIES FOR COMMUNISM

In the face of U.S. objections, the United Nations has gone ahead and signed an agreement to give Communist Cuba \$1½ million for an agricultural research institute. The U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization will supply experts for the staff, and it was said no U.S. dollars would be used to pay them.

The money comes out of the United Nations special fund. The United States contributes 40 percent of the fund's financial resources, and in the last 5 years has donated \$100 million to the fund. When the U.N. says no American dollars will go to the Cuban project, it is like saying that the money you earn is not being spent when your wife writes checks against the account.

This is only 1 of 16 projects for which Cuba is receiving U.N. aid. Representative DUNWAD G. HALL, of Missouri, has listed some of them. We are paying for the revision of Cuban schoolbooks which will glorify communism. We are paying so that Cubans may learn to fly and service airplanes at a U.N. training center in Mexico City. The planes have military capabilities. We are helping provide a fishery study for Castro which will

improve his fishing fleet, a fleet equally useful in running guns to create trouble in Central America. The project also involves improving Cuban ports, which may wind up servicing Soviet submarines.

As the old saying has it, never give a sucker a break. We're the suckers.

Washington: On the Potential Power of the Moderates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times May 12, 1963:

WASHINGTON: ON THE POTENTIAL POWER OF THE MODERATES

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, May 11.—The greatest potential force for commonsense in this country lies with the detached, unorganized, and usually inarticulate moderates.

When these busy but normally quiet men of business are startled out of their personal and professional preoccupation, as they were this week in Birmingham, Ala., they can be immensely effective. But when they avoid the struggle, as they often do, the field is left to the extremists.

Unfortunately, at this period in the Nation's life, commanding national figures in the professions seem to be in short supply. Nobody in the law quite fills the role of the Henry Stimsons or Elihu Root of an earlier time. There are a few extinguished volcanoes around, like John L. Lewis, but the towering preachers, editors, university presidents, and labor-union leaders of the past seem to have been replaced by more prudent and less outspoken managers.

There are exceptions, of course, but more often than not the best lawyers do not speak for the law, the best doctors do not speak for the medical profession; each group has its political leaders, and the moderates tend to stand aside.

THE QUIET CAMPAIGN

Fortunately, this did not happen to the same extent in Birmingham this week. Moderate opinion was organized. Roger Blough of United States Steel got in touch with the moderates of his vast steel enterprises in Birmingham and appealed for compromise. The leaders of the big chain stores with branches in Birmingham did the same. Private professional men called to one another across the geographic and racial barriers. Lawyers here and in the South appealed to old classmates in Birmingham. Ministers cried to the Negro preachers there for caution. Top Government officials here called the bankers of the South and urged them to speak out for time, if not for compromise.

Maybe in the end the truce will break down, but the Nation has had a glimpse in this crisis of what could be done if somehow the moderates could find time in their busy lives to work for moderation and reconciliation.

The Government in Washington has an important but limited role to play. The Federal judiciary will continue to speak out. The Federal executive can act when Federal law is violated, as at the University of Mississippi, but many of the difficult problems

May 13

A2974

that remain are likely to respond more to cooperation among moderate private individuals than to pronouncements or troops out of Washington.

Paradoxically, the conservative businessmen of the South are probably having more effect on producing compromise in many of these delicate situations now than the liberal politicians in the North. They may not want racial integration but they want business, and they want the South to benefit from the transforming scientific revolution of the age.

MORALS AND BUSINESS

There have been many other times in the past when the American businessman has found that he had to take part in public affairs to protect his own interests. Sometimes on the old frontier this took the form of buying up legislatures to assure the passage of laws that were not always in the public interest.

Today, however, many businessmen in the South are beginning to see that by serving the public interest and defending the law they are serving their own interests and the development and prosperity of their region.

Beyond the tragic field of racial conflict, however, this moderate force in American life can serve the national interest more than it is. For example, the letters to the editors columns, dominated in so many cities by propagandists and crackpots, are open to the moderate lawyers and doctors and teachers, so many of whom reserve their opinions for the drawing room.

Political life, too, as President Eisenhower has been saying, is too serious a business to be left to the professional politicians. And moderates in business and in labor unions have had the opportunity to see in recent days what can be done if they will not pass by on the other side.

This country is not as divided as it sounds. It only seems so because the extremists organize and speak out and the moderates do not.

Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER H. DOMINICK

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I recently received an editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer of March 31, 1963, entitled "We Apologize Too Much." The editorial deals with the bewilderment of the people of the United States in connection with our foreign policy apropos of Castro and Cuba. Since the editorial summarizes the feelings of so many frustrated but freedom-loving Americans, I should like to draw it to the attention of Senators. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

WE APOLOGIZE TOO MUCH

Is the supreme, overriding consideration in Washington to save face for Nikita Khrushchev and his Cuban stooge, Fidel Castro? Certain events would make it appear so.

Our Government seems to be falling all over itself to curb any sporadic attacks on the new Communist island fortress, lest it enrage Castro and upset our relations with Khrushchev (whatever they may be).

Under the Neutrality Act, we have the right and probably the duty to keep any armed excursions against Fidel-land from being staged on our shores by Cuban patriots.

But what they do beyond our territorial waters is strictly none of our business, and our groveling apologies to Moscow and Havana make us appear weak (and ridiculous) in the eyes of the world.

CASTRO DOESN'T APOLOGIZE FOR HIS ADVENTURES

Has Castro rushed forward with any official apologies for the repeated instances in which Cuban agents have acted against the sovereignty of other Latin-American states? Has he apologized for the confiscation without recompense of many hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of American property in Cuba. No. All he has done is accept an unprecedented ransom for the prisoners of the Bay-of-Pigs fiasco—and to exact a heavy financial tribute from any Cuban-American citizen who leaves his new Communist paradise.

Not one but a number of Americans have been shot down in flights over Communist territory. We don't recall that Castro apologized for the death of the Virginia major whose flight finally established beyond doubt that Russia had sneaked offensive missiles and bombers into ready positions in Cuba—although the major's body was returned as an "act of kindness."

AMERICAN FLIERS NEVER RETURN FROM RUSSIA

A number of American fliers—some of them trapped into flying over the Turkish border into Russia by spurious radio beams—have never been returned, alive or dead.

Yet several weeks ago, Russian planes flew over Alaska for almost half an hour. They were intercepted, but not downed or compelled to land. Our State Department delivered a protest over what it called the first overflight of American territory—and the Russians calmly denied that any such incident had taken place. They said their planes had never been closer than 75 miles to Alaska and our vital installations there.

We accepted the note, while someone in Washington mumbled something about its having been bad weather.

Long-range Russian bombers (used for reconnaissance purposes) have leisurely flown over two of our biggest aircraft carriers, taking pictures to their hearts' content. They were escorted, to use the Pentagon term, by American interceptors, and Washington hastily pointed out that the Russians had every right to be there. Our Chief of Naval Operations went on to say that "we learned more than they."

For one thing—although this obviously was not what he meant—the Russians seem to be able to pinpoint our big flattops in the vastness of the oceans. The atom-powered *Constellation* was off Midway and the *Enterprise* was in mid-Atlantic. This was a remarkable performance, alongside our apparent difficulty in spotting hijacked ocean liners and incoming freighters filled with missiles and bombers on their decks. And it is hardly enough to say that in wartime the Russian Bears would have been shot down before reaching the carriers. Under war conditions, once located, the carrier would have been attacked by missiles, not lumbering bombers of the Bear type.

We have photographed the imitation fishing vessels loaded with photographic and electronic gear that have anchored off the coast of Florida and monitored our missile fringes, and those that have deployed in the Pacific to check on our atomic tests, but it escapes us what we have gained in the process. If the Russians had an immense new atomic-powered aircraft carrier on the high seas, we wonder if they would have facilitated as many as nine photographic runs over it by American planes. After all, they repeatedly have "buzzed" ordinary transport

planes flying the prescribed routes into and out of West Berlin. And never apologized.

On etiquette, we're outdoing them. But the Communists have not yet given any indication that Little Lord Fauntleroy behavior impresses them. Strangely enough, they often interpret it as a sign of weakness.

United Nations Special Session May 14

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the 110 members of the United Nations General Assembly will meet in New York in special session. Their business is to reach agreement on how much each nation will pay to the cost of U.N. police and peacekeeping forces ordered into troubled areas. An excellent summary of the choices facing the Assembly appears in the May 13 *Christian Science Monitor*.

In slightly shortened form the article reads as follows:

WHO PAYS THE WORLD POLICEMAN?

(By Earl W. Foell)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—When His Excellency Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, the sagely bearded President of the General Assembly, calls that organization to order in special session Tuesday, the United Nations will return once again to wrestling with the thorny question of how to pay the world policeman.

Should the rich pay most of the bill? The poor none or next to none? Should cold-war parties be liable for higher assessments because they magnify the policing jobs? Should aggressors pay an extra penalty? Should victims be exempted? Should the big powers have more say in peacemaking decisions if they pay more?

Or should all the U.N.'s members pay the unexpected costs for policing the trouble spots of the world—the Congo and Gaza strips—at their regular rates of taxation in the world community?

This special session of the General Assembly has been called to find an answer among these questions. Specifically, the U.N. is seeking a solution to the problem of paying the Congo and Middle East bills for the last half of 1963. But beyond the short term answer, many members of the world organization hope to establish some precedents which will help the U.N. undertake policing duties in the future without risking insolvency in the process. And officials hope to begin breaking the general logjam of unpaid back dues.

After Korea the Soviets lost part of the effectiveness of their veto in the Security Council under the "uniting for peace" resolution which transferred peacekeeping power to the General Assembly when the Security Council is stymied. Ever since, the Communists have been trying to recover control of such operations by asserting that the Assembly had no power to assess members to pay for the policing.

There have been three major points of view here on paying for peacekeeping operations like the Congo, and many variations. Britain's compromise plan is essentially intended to bridge the gap between the American viewpoint and the Afro-Asian-Latin American one. If it does so, the third viewpoint, the Soviet's bloc's (with which France, Portugal, South Africa, and several non-

that there has been between our two countries and our two governments, and to the deep and abiding interest of the free Jewish communities of your country in what we in Israel have been seeking to do with our independence in the interests of the Jewish people and of the Jewish future. In view of that, there is no need for me to speak very long.

We are a small country living in a turbulent area and I suppose it is natural that during the last few weeks in particular people have been asking me primarily about the external problems of Israel. Permit me to say that I don't regard these external problems as being the decisive questions for our future. I hold to the view that in the uncertainty and unpredictability of our times, the factor that is decisive for a people's future and for its destiny is its internal health; the nature of its sense of national purpose; the quality of the dedication of its people to the attainment of that purpose; the degree of its alertness to danger and the extent of the will and the determination of its people to meet that danger.

After 15 years of our independent existence as a nation, I think I can say to you, and not in a spirit of boastfulness, that I can report very positively on those points. The purpose of Israel is positive and not negative. We hate no one. We are not at war with anyone. Our fight in Israel is against the pockets of backwardness among our own people and against the desert area which still remains in our land. Our battle is with disease, ignorance, and the desert. Independence for us is not an end in itself, but an instrument in the hands of the people to improve its condition and assure its possibility of self-expression in freedom. It is in that spirit that we have dedicated ourselves in these last 15 years to the rebuilding of our people and the rebuilding of our land.

In our tradition, the absolute value is life, human life, lived as it should be lived by people who conceive of themselves as having been fashioned and created in the image of God. It is this passion for life which has carried the Jewish people through its tortuous course of history, from Haman through Hitler and past him, and which will carry it into the future.

It is for these reasons that I can report to you after fifteen years in which we have been surrounded by continuous hostility that we have grown stronger, both absolutely and relatively. The diplomatic offensive launched against us has not prevented us extending the network of our diplomatic and friendly relations with countries in all the continents of the world. The economic offensive launched against us has not prevented Israel from sustaining a continuous economic growth. And so I believe I can tell you on this occasion that the evil design of Israel's elimination is not realistic. We in Israel in 1963 are the only people in the Middle East which lives in the same place and speaks the same language as its ancestors spoke in that place 3,000 years ago. We have roots in this place and we have deepened and strengthened those roots during the utilization of our independence in these past 15 years.

We are not blind to the dangers that surround us at the present time. We are not blind to the fact that there is an evil design against us. We are not an anti-Arab people. We recognize the legitimacy of the existence of the Arab states in our area and the legitimacy of their independence. We strive for the goal of Arab-Israeli cooperation which in our view could transform the whole character of the Middle East and give fulfillment to the dreams and needs of all its peoples and lift it back again to the proud place which it occupied in the history of human civilization thousands of years ago.

But we see the doctrine of belligerence repeatedly proclaimed around us, the most recent example being the declaration that was

made in Cairo on April the 17th, just a couple of weeks ago, by Egypt, Iraq, and Syria, in which there was talk about the liberation of "Palestine" as the central purpose of this new Arab unity idea. Whether there is Arab unity or not in the Middle East and what kind of Arab unity there is going to be is not our concern. How the Arab choose to live among themselves is their business and not ours. What concerns us is whether this is a free expression of independent peoples or the result of an expansionist policy and purpose is to be directed against us, and not only against us in the Middle East. It is inconceivable to us that the world in which the only hope for survival is the doctrine enshrined in the United Nations Charter should tolerate a doctrine of violence completely opposed to the principles and the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations.

The elimination of Israel is an unrealistic goal. We in Israel are not a Warsaw ghetto. The danger to the peace of the Middle East and to the peace of the world lies in the possibility of a miscalculation that those who harbor this desire should be permitted for a moment to feel that the world would tolerate their attempt to put into practice, or the preparation on their part so to do.

And so as I thank you for these sentiments of encouragement and support which have been uttered here today on the occasion of my country's 15th anniversary, I would like in conclusion, just briefly, to sum up the basic guiding lines of Israel's policy at this time.

We in Israel, despite this unremitting hostility, have kept the minds and hearts of our people wide open to the vision of peace with our neighbors and we shall continue to do so. We hope that the whole world will never cease to remind the countries living in the Middle East of their obligation to the world to settle their differences and the disputes between them by peaceful means in the process of mutual negotiation.

The second basis of our policy is this, 14 years ago we signed armistice agreements with our Arab neighbors. Those armistice agreements were envisaged, as all armistice agreements should be, as being a transient phase leading from war to peace. We have continuously asked our Arab neighbors to move forward to that next phase, to move forward from armistice to the resolution of the problems between us by negotiation looking toward relations of real peace between them and us. That offer has been spurned. We have been able to live in this situation because by and large, with some violent exceptions, although the armistice has not moved forward to peace, it was marked in recent years by a condition of refraining from the disturbance of our borders by shooting across them. That is the only condition which makes this twilight kind of relationship feasible in our area, as it is the only condition that makes this twilight period in which the whole world is living in at the present time feasible. There is no peace in the world. Life is tolerable in conditions of no peace because there is no shooting. It is the hope of Israel and the purpose of Israel to maintain this condition of no shooting until we can move forward toward the transformation of this situation into a condition of real peace.

Thirdly, we see around us the active preparation of the Arab States for war and we counter these steps on their part by the building up of the defensive strength of Israel. The defense policy of Israel is not aimed at making it possible for Israel to win a war. The defense policy of Israel is designed to make it possible for Israel to deter a war. We have succeeded in this policy in the past 15 years. It is our hope and conviction that the free world will understand the vital importance of making it pos-

sible for that policy to continue so as to avoid the point of explosion and remove any kind of basis for miscalculation.

Finally, I would say this. That while doing all that, while keeping itself open for peace, while retaining the measure or quiescence that exists, while deterring the possibility of attack against it in the future, we in Israel as a free people understand that all this is possible only if, in the process of doing this, we continue to build and live the freedom that we are seeking to protect. And we shall bend all our energies in the years ahead to continue along that path: to push back the desert; to replace ignorance by educated civic consciousness; to move forward in our endeavor; to repay to the Jewish people what it has invested in us. And to continue to satisfy the urgent needs of large segments of the Jewish people that look to us for home and for hope.

It is in that spirit, ladies and gentlemen, that I thank you on behalf of the Government and people of Israel for the friendship of your country, of your Government and of the great Jewish community of this land and pledge to you that the freedom which Israel has been living and building these past 15 years will continue to be built and to be lived in the endless time that stretches ahead of us as a free and independent people. Thank you.

Cuba: Showcase of Our Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, one after another high officials of our Government has been saying that Cuba is a showcase of Communist failure.

This "Red herring" can hardly cover up the unpleasant fact that in reality Cuba is a showcase of American failure.

From the Bay of Pigs blot on our history on down to our present admission that there are more Soviet troops in Cuba than previously estimated the administration has continued to take the self-congratulatory view that all is well. The argument infers that President Kennedy scored a great victory when he persuaded Mr. K. to say he would recall his nuclear missiles. Overlooked, of course, is our retreat on promised inspections to assure that the missiles were withdrawn and our unwillingness to insist on the Soviets recalling their troops.

Mr. Speaker, as long as the Soviets hold a Communist beachhead in Cuba and as long as the Monroe Doctrine is being violated—then Cuba is a showcase of our failure.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is an editorial from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer which speaks out clearly on this point:

WE DISAGREE

We beg to disagree with one of our favorite Washington personalities, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson. Yes; it is pleasant to know that Castro's Cuba is in all kinds of trouble and may more of it happen to the Red murderers who rule the island.

But can you refer to Cuba as a "showcase of Communist failure," as L.B.J. did in a speech Saturday?

May 13

A2978

Not as long as thousands and thousands of Russian troops—the exact number of thousands is unimportant—remain there to strengthen the hemisphere's Communist fortification with each passing day.

Cuba is a showcase of Red cruelty, repression and brutality.

But it is a Communist "success" until the last Soviet soldier is eliminated one way or another, and until Castro and his bloody killers are themselves overthrown.

The good executive is the voice of his company—both written and spoken. Thus, he is a reader, student, speaker, moderator, writer * * * as well as the subject of a speech or article. He is the product of business and means business. What he does can produce a ripple or a tidal wave of activity.

Although his collar is white and his shoes are polished, he knows the meaning of long hours and hard work. For this he has learned; to get a better job, keep doing a better job.

That's how executives are made.

WHAT IS A CONGRESSMAN?

(By Luther Patrick)

"A Congressman," he said, "has become an expanded messenger boy, an employment agency, getter-out of the Navy, Army, and Marines, a wardheeler, a wound healer, trouble shooter, law explainer, bill finder, issue translator, resolution interpreter, controversy-oil-pourer, glad hand extender, business promoter, convention goer, civic good will promoter, veterans affairs adjuster, ex-serviceman's champion, watchdog for the underdog, sympathizer for the upper dog, kisser of babies, recoverer of lost baggage, soberor of delegates, adjuster for traffic violators and voters straying into Washington and into the toils of the law, binderup of broken hearts, financial wet nurse, a good samaritan, contributor to good causes—cornerstone layer, public building and bridge dedicatior, ship christener. To be sure, he does get in a little flag waving, and a little constitutional holsting and spread eagle work, but it is getting harder every day to find time to properly study legislation, the very business we are primarily here to discharge, and it must be done above all things."

Hazardous Duty Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the military pay bill last Wednesday, May 8, I spoke on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) to provide extra pay for hazardous duty. I made the statement:

I would venture to say that not a single Member of the House had one letter, one telegram in behalf of combat pay.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a telegram which was delivered to my office while I was present on the floor, and which I had not seen prior to my remarks. The telegram is from Mr. Francis Stover, legislative director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and is in support of combat pay. The text of the telegram follows:—

MAY 8, 1963.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Veterans of Foreign Wars grievously shocked that H.R. 5555 excludes hostile fire, or combat pay. Combat veterans are bewildered that reported bill has made no provision for this small group who are doing the fighting and dying but does have over \$600 million in extra pay for other types of per-

formance. The VFW urgently requests your support and vote in favor of amendment to have the administration's recommendation to include extra pay for those who are guarding our freedoms all over the globe.

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

California Editor Looks to Barry Goldwater To Give America Needed Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most powerful voices of public opinion in the United States are the community newspapers, published in the small towns of America, most of them on a weekly basis. In the opinions of the nearly 10,000 editors of weekly newspapers we find the real grassroots sentiment of this country, far closer to what America is thinking than in the much publicized opinion polls, sometimes slanted to bring about a desired decision.

I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the smalltown newspapers of this Nation and the courageous editors who have helped shape the destiny of America since the first days of our fight for independence and the establishment of a new kind of government of, for and by the people.

It is because I have such a thorough respect for the opinions of the smalltown editors and their influence in the communities they serve, that I insert as a part of these remarks, the following editorial from the Delano Record, Delano, Calif., concerning the lack of leadership under the Kennedy administration and the need for the kind of leader America will find in BARRY GOLDWATER:

THE OTHER SIDE

(By Mel Baughman)

Where is America going?

The question stems from the current confusion and contradictions in the day-to-day operation of our Nation's Government, which, if their implications were not so serious for the future of this Nation, would almost be funny.

A year ago we were treated to the spectacle of the awesome power of the Presidency being used to deny a hike in steel prices. Today, deeper in the semantic swamps to which we have been taken by the New Frontier, we see that steel makers will be allowed "selective increases" in prices. Government by man's whim and fancy replaces government by law. Forces of a free market economy remain bound by Lilliputian bureaucrats.

Years ago we were told that defense must not be restricted by consideration of the balanced budget. Today, in the TFX affair, tactical and strategic considerations and battle-tested military opinion are ignored in the McNamara monarchy's insistence on "commonality."

Months ago we were told that foreign aid would be essential at the level proposed by the President in his January budget. Yet

A Congressman's Duties as Compared to Those of an Executive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the monthly newsletter of the Carthage, Tenn., Rotary Club recently carried an amusing article entitled "What Is an Executive?" In reading this brief article I was reminded of a speech given several years ago by our late colleague, the Honorable Luther Patrick, of Alabama, who pointed out that a Congressman also has a variety of duties as an executive, a legislator, as well as a multiplicity of jobs unknown and unrelated.

Mr. Speaker, I believe many of my colleagues will enjoy reading the article from the Rotary Club newsletter on "What Is an Executive?" and also will find interesting and amusing Congressman Patrick's remarks about the duties of an elected Representative which might be headed "What Is a Congressman?"

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the excerpts from these statements in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the monthly newsletter of the Carthage (Tenn.) Rotary Club]

WHAT IS AN EXECUTIVE?

He is called by many names: The boss, top management, head man, the chief, president, vice president, treasurer, owner, partner, chairman, his initials, or just plain "Tom" or "Joe." Each day he lives with problems and every day he is on the lookout for solutions. A good executive is understanding, fair, a cajoler, coordinator, arbitrator, listener, and decider. In addition he is efficient, hard-working, patient, impatient, aggressive, ambitious for himself and for his firm.

His constant companions are work, too little time, budgets, taxes, inventory, ideas, new products, production, employee relations, profit and loss charts, marketing, advertising, and company dollars. No one knows better than he the meaning of pressure. He is second-guessed, loved, appreciated, tolerated, respected, blamed, praised, understood, misunderstood, needling and needed, but never ignored.

The executive knows the loneliness of management. For there comes a time for decisions. Despite all the counsel from associates, above and below, it is he who says "yes" or "no." He can't afford to err in judgment, whether it be in the selection of personnel or the kinds of raw materials that go into the product. He is always responsible.

"The Republicans feel that the way to create this condition is to unleash business and to encourage the private sector of the economy.

"I am against the approach of Government finding people jobs in Government initiated programs," he said.

The third problem he considered was the effectiveness of the Congress. "Is it equipped to transmit the will of the people into action?" Mr. CLEVELAND asked. "There is a strong feeling that it is not," was his answer.

"One of the problems is this: Tools of the Congress have not been developed, and this is mainly due to the staffing problem."

"This has been called a do-nothing Congress," observed Mr. CLEVELAND. "But sometimes it is a very intelligent thing to do nothing—especially in cases of wild presidential schemes."

"If Congress is not coming up with constructive alternatives to presidential proposals, it is because of the need for tremendous staffs. For the Congress to come up with constructive alternatives, there must also be staff people responsible to Republicans.

"If the Republican Party is going to perform the historic function of the minority party, it has got to have the staff to do it. In opposition to President Kennedy's organization of over 10,000 men, such a staff is necessary if we are to maintain a government of checks and balances," concluded Congressman CLEVELAND.

SENATOR MONAHAN: NEW HAMPSHIRE
SWEEPSTAKES

In a preliminary speech, State Senator Robert S. Monahan spoke out against the New Hampshire sweepstakes bill which has passed both the house and the senate. This, Senator Monahan noted, occurred "despite the fact that the majority and minority leaders of both bodies opposed it."

"Governor King will have 5 days to act upon the bill when it reaches his desk. He has voted for it twice as a house member. He has not taken a position on the present bill, but the general feeling is that he will allow the bill to become law without his signature," said Senator Monahan.

"My own feeling is that it won't be long before Federal marshals will check on transportation of tickets across State lines. The State of New Hampshire will be guilty of encouraging people to violate Federal law which prohibits the transportation of these tickets across State lines," stated Senator Monahan.

Use of Federal Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, my attention has been called to editorial comments in the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., on the subject of the recent report by the State of Mississippi on the use of force by the Federal Government in the incident at Oxford, Miss., last fall. In view of the fact that the use of Federal force is again being contemplated in Birmingham, Ala., I think it is most appropriate that these editorial comments from the Greenville News of May 3, 1963, entitled "Yes, It Was Plain Police Brutality" be included

in the RECORD. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YES, IT WAS PLAIN POLICE BRUTALITY

One needs to do no more than read the Associated Press account we published on page 1 recently to know that there is substance to the report of a special Mississippi legislative committee that prisoners taken by the U.S. marshals last fall on the University of Mississippi campus were mistreated.

They were subjected to what is popularly called police brutality which went far beyond that which is generally enough to set Federal agents to scurrying and congressional committees to investigating—all at the instigation of some self-appointed minority advancement or protective group.

The AP story summarized the charges of the committee in the lead, followed with two paragraphs quoting the Justice Department as denying the truth of the report and went on to give more details from the committee report.

That was enough for us at the time, but we now have more information from at least one person who was on the scene, one who interviewed many more who also were there and saw phases of the situation that he did not.

And the Office of Bobby Kennedy can call it slanderous and point out that certain persons, including Federal authorities, were not interviewed by the investigators to its heart's content.

Whatever the provocation, however unruly the mob might have been, the marshals and to some extent, the combat troops who followed them in used unduly and unlawfully harsh tactics in handling prisoners, some of whom were guilty of nothing more than being caught at or near the scene.

They were treated as prisoners would be treated in Castro's Cuba or Khrushchev's Russia. They were lined up, forced to clasp their hand behind their heads and hold them there; and woe be unto him who became fatigued and slipped from this uncomfortable position.

They were virtually stripped to be searched and the officers were as careless with their clubs as they were when they fired the tear gas shells point blank into the crowds.

No one in authority has yet denied the episode of the detainment in a garage-like building of many more prisoners than the place would hold, that they were forced to sit for hours in a cramped position, denied food, water, medicine or sanitary activities and shoved or clubbed if they moved.

These were mainly college students and other young people, mind you, and only a few were toughs from the outside.

Among others the Department of Justice said should have been interviewed were newsmen who were on the scene. Well, we just happen to have an editorial on the subject written by editor James J. (Jack) Kilpatrick of the Richmond News Leader who arrived on the campus on the Monday morning after the worst of the violence.

Here, in part, is how he summarized it:

"We were there at 7 o'clock on the morning of Monday, October 1, while the tear gas still drifted in stinging patches across the university campus. We stayed in the Lyceum, the university's administration building, or very near it, until 4 o'clock that afternoon.

"We were in the front hall of the Lyceum as the marshals lined up their captives. These prisoners were mostly high school and college boys, with a scattering of scruffy hill-types.

"All morning long, the marshals kept them

standing in line with their hands clasped on their heads. After so long a time, the position gets to be agonizing.

"One by one, the prisoners were jerked forward and told to lean against a wall. Then a marshal would loosen the captive's belt, pull his trousers halfway down, and dump the pockets on the floor. Thus frisked, the captives then were escorted, or shoved, into an interrogation room.

"After a while, they were marched in groups, hands again clasped above their heads, to another room downstairs. Except in a handful of cases, no charges were filed against any of them. From the downstairs room they were marched to two prison buses parked in front of the lyceum, where the tear gas was thickest.

"And there they sat, all day, their eyes burning, without food, water, or toilet facilities, and without opportunity to seek counsel. Late in the afternoon, most of them were released.

"We were there, in the lyceum, at the stroke of noon, when Gen. Ted Walker was hauled away. One marshal would have been plenty of escort. Mr. Kennedy's burly commander, Mr. McShane, felt five husky deputies were required. They shoved Walker in a bum's rush down the hall, giving him plenty of hard elbow in the kidneys, and piled him into a waiting sedan.

"Then they smacked him with \$100,000 ball (convicted Communists, pending appeal, are free on \$5,000 bail), and on the say-so of some psychiatrist 2,000 miles away, who read about Walker in the papers, they jerryrigged an order to slap Walker in a nut house.

"We were there in the town square of Oxford that Monday morning, when Federal troops closed off the area and made it their own domain. We were there when MP's with fixed bayonets forced local women and children out of their cars in order to search the automobiles.

"We were there when private merchants, remote from the riot, were ordered to close their shops; we were there when law-abiding townspeople were denied access to their own local courthouse.

"On October 1 and 2, we talked to a score of newspaper, radio-TV, and magazine correspondents who had been physically present on the campus on Sunday night, September 30, when the riot occurred.

"Overwhelmingly, they agreed that experienced police officers could have prevented the riot by keeping their heads. They did not exonerate the students, but they put primary blame on the trigger-happy McShane and his undisciplined deputy marshals.

"This was an ugly riot. We don't propose to pretty it up. But in our own view, 'brutality' is a fair word for the marshals' conduct. If the shoe fits, Bobby, put it on."

Even this isn't all. During Clemson's hours of trial, we spent an entire evening with two newsmen who had been at Oxford and talked with others who had been there. Some of these men received extra pay for enduring the hazards of a riot, but they wanted no part of another Oxford incident.

Also, our State editor interviewed and wrote the story of a student who transferred from Ole Miss to Clemson at the beginning of this semester. This boy was lucky enough not to get caught directly in the disorder, but as he drove away from the Ole Miss campus toward his home, he was stopped on the open highway by troops. He was forced to take all his belongings, clothing and other things one needs in school, out of his car and spread them out in a pouring rain for inspection.

There's no need for us here to draw a contrast between this and what would have happened if the beleaguered police in certain Southern cities handled Negro demonstrators even one-tenth as roughly.

The mockery of it is that all of it was done in the name of the law of the land.

May 13

A2970

Maybe the Attorney General acted out of excessive zeal for civil rights, but he made a shambles of civil liberty.

And unless the administration supplements its denial with hard factual proof, the Mississippi report stands as far as we are concerned. It has been substantially corroborated by what the Department of Justice called objective observers.

President Kennedy Lacks Consistency in Budget Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, much of the confusion in the United States today is caused by the lack of consistency of President Kennedy on fundamental problems facing us. Nowhere has the President been on more sides of the subject than he has when discussing the budget, inflation, fiscal responsibility. It is impossible to know from one day to the next what the "party line" from the White House will be.

To refresh our memories it would be well to study the many views of the President on the budget as reported by Henry J. Taylor in the following column from the Los Angeles Times of May 6.

Perhaps it is time to ask, indeed to demand, that the President stop repudiating his campaign statements and live up to his promises.

The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 6, 1963]
PRESIDENT'S VIEWS ON THE BUDGET
(By Henry J. Taylor)

Our President must turn against every normal, selfish impulse and return to his spoken guarantees.

It was on these that he was entrusted with the care of our Nation and, indeed, of our very lives.

Many of the guarantees remain unredeemed in both the foreign policy area and economic area. But a start is timely regarding the budget, now under debate in Congress.

Our President is deliberately demanding, promoting, and fighting for an unbalanced budget. His arguments supporting this theory are currently famous. And he is swinging, full punch, at the congressional resistance.

Yet, it is morally and intellectually impossible for our President to unsay his own guarantees:

September 26, 1960: "I believe in the balanced budget."

October 7, 1960: "I said last week I believed in a balanced budget. We can balance the budget unless we have a national emergency or a severe depression."

October 13, 1960: "I state again that I believe in a balanced budget and have supported that concept during my 14 years in Congress. Here is where I stand and I just want to have it on the public record."

October 27, 1960: "Statements have been made that I am in favor of unbalancing the budget. That is wholly wrong, wholly in error. That is not my view and I think it ought to be stated very clearly in the record."

November 2, 1960: "To hold down the cost of living we must strike at inflation on all fronts. To do this we should balance the budget."

Now, this conflict—100 percent—between expressed convictions makes it impossible to know what Mr. Kennedy believes. Does a broken conviction give strength to a second conviction, which is the reverse? Do two broken convictions add up to the truth? Where do we go in the face of a situation like this?

We seek, we need, we must have guidance from our President. Congress seeks guidance. In fact, the whole free world seeks guidance from the President.

We cannot be told one thing on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays and another thing on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays. Neither can the world. And neither can this practice be permitted among responsible subordinates.

When Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon sought confirmation of his appointment before the Senate Finance Committee, he stated, "Everything we do depends on having a sound fiscal system." He called a balanced budget "essential for national security."

Within 90 days he was calling deficits "not a cause for alarm." And to this very day Dillon is calling the continuing deficits "entirely appropriate."

Name this performance anything you wish, it does not contain convictions. For convictions cannot be manufactured to suit a moment, a purpose or a person. Convictions can be right. They can be wrong. But they have to be convictions.

A great storm cloud mounts and darkens and its crimson rim reaches out to suck down the sun. The whole, round earth watches the fire-flying monsters of the Kremlin, wondering where trouble will come and when.

Instead of the four freedoms we have the four fears: fear of war; fear of inflation, fear of bankruptcy, fear of defeat. It will take much careful performance and a great deal of personal carrying power in the President's great name to carry us through these.

The two indispensable ingredients—absolutely indispensable—are convictions and integrity. The heart these can sing to is the heart of America and the heart of the free world.

In press conferences, on TV, in all media reaching our people, if the President has changed his mind on repeatedly stated fundamentals, we need to be told this. It is not enough, and certainly not permissible, merely to rely on the public's forgetfulness—as about budget convictions, convictions prohibiting the Soviet lodgement in Cuba, etc.—and then break off on a completely reverse course.

If credence goes, everything goes. Nothing is so costly to our authority in the world and, therefore, to peace.

The Kennedy Line on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, for months Republicans in Congress have been calling for an explanation of the administration's lack of positive action in dealing with Soviet influence in this hemisphere. But our criticism and questions have been met with countercharges of "irre-

sponsibility" and implications that we are advocating war.

It is interesting to me, therefore, to read in the Richmond (Va.) News Leader for April 25, an editorial account of the President's attitude on Cuba by an unnamed member of the National Security Council.

This unofficial line reveals some not-too-surprising attitudes on the part of the Kennedy administration. It reveals what the logical extension of the "twilight struggle" policy on communism as applied to Cuba has accomplished—the tightening of the Soviet grip on the island and the further infiltration of other Latin American countries from the Red base in the Caribbean.

This attitude naively regards any criticism of the President as an indication of lack of confidence or casting of doubt on his veracity. It cannot tolerate constructive criticism by the minority party, yet it never invites Republicans to participate in foreign policy decisions. Then it demands full support of the woefully inadequate policies by all Members of Congress. I believe it behooves every Member of the House and Senate concerned with a workable strategy to end Communist subversion in Latin America to read the following editorial, "The Kennedys on Cuba":

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, Apr. 25, 1963]

THE KENNEDYS ON CUBA

A member of President Kennedy's National Security Council the other day treated a reporter friend of his to a frank but nonattributive discussion of just what the official line is on Cuba. While the facts aren't startling, the attitude is.

First of all, the official line is one of indignation against anybody who doubts the President's veracity. When the President last summer was talking about Russian "technicians" and "defensive weapons" in Cuba, that's all that were there. As soon as the President found out for certain that Soviet troops and offensive weapons had been rushed in under closed hatches, he promptly reported to the American people. Persons like Senator KEATING who prematurely reported on these same things were either just guessing or were spreading gossip from excitable Cuban refugees.

Next, anybody who worries unduly about the Soviet presence in Cuba lacks "faith" in America. It's just inconceivable that 17,000 Russian soldiers in the Caribbean could endanger the United States. As to the argument that Russians are needed to teach Castro anything about revolutionizing Latin America, that's silly because Castro is a pretty good revolutionist himself.

There are many ways (although none were specified in this talk) by which Cuba can get rid of Castro. But we can't have a Navy blockade and we can't tolerate anti-Communist raiders for one simple reason—some Russians might be killed. If one or more Russians were killed, that would endanger the lives of 60 million Americans who might be incinerated in a nuclear exchange.

Finally, the presence of Russian troops in Cuba is no more alarming than their presence in Berlin. Communism is a worldwide menace, and it isn't at all surprising that it has spread to an island that lies offshore from Florida.

There is nothing new in these revelations. A lot of people who don't like the administration have been saying all along that the Kennedy brothers are peevish about criticism, bankrupt in initiative, disingenuous in finding excuses and timid about taking

action. But to hear it from the horse's mouth is pretty distressing. And how we wish it were otherwise.

It would be wonderful to hear from an inside source that the President had kicked himself in the pants over past mistakes and vowed like a man to do better. It would be good to hear that he went into a justifiable rage at the effrontery of Russia's invasion of our hemisphere. We think the implied idea that one Russian death might be avenged by millions of American deaths ought to be reversed. Our enemies ought to be told, and told emphatically, that they will be held accountable for every American life taken or threatened in any part of the world. This is language, and action, they can understand.

The True Meaning of "Aloha"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUE

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a speech delivered by Gov. John A. Burns, of the State of Hawaii, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as it exemplifies the real meaning of the Hawaiian word "Aloha." Too much emphasis has been given to that word by way of a commercial interpretation. I think the time is opportune for a real definition of the term which is so dear to the hearts of all in Hawaii.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. JOHN A. BURNS TO THE ASSOCIATION OF HAWAIIAN CIVIC CLUBS, KAILUA-KONA, HAWAII, APRIL 19, 1963

It is indeed a pleasure to be with you here tonight, particularly in this setting and in this place. I have always had a special fondness for Kona, which represents to many of us the idyllic retreat to which we would like to retire when the cares of our more urban pursuits weigh too heavily on us.

It is especially fitting that your association selected this site to convene—to reflect on your achievements to date and to chart your future course and objectives.

The timing of your convention is also particularly appropriate. For, once again, events of recent weeks have focused the spotlight of public attention on the role of our Hawaiian friends and neighbors in our community.

I believe that in the latest and previous public discussion there has been a tendency to overlook or minimize what I regard as the very great contribution which the Hawaiians have made and are making to our culture and our way of life.

Our common and popular standards of accomplishment—our very definition and understanding of success—all too frequently emphasize material wealth and professional and social status.

Fortunately, these values are not accepted universally as the final measure of success.

Who are we to say whether the homesteader at Waima or on Molokai is not as successful as the business baron of Merchant Street.

In terms of attitude toward the meaning of life and values which cannot be measured by a cash register or a bank account, I contend that Hawaiians are more successful than the rest of us.

The graceful friendliness, the unhesitating generosity, which we recognize as the aloha spirit, are attributes which characterize our Hawaiian people. These qualities have been transmuted throughout the islands and have served to enrich the lives of all of us in Hawaii.

Without this spirit—this quality of friendliness—these islands would be just so many volcanic outcroppings covered with trees and houses and populated by men and women of no specially noteworthy characteristic.

These islands would not be Hawaii.

There are other islands elsewhere just as beautiful or more so.

But there is no other Hawaii, and for this priceless distinction and heritage we are indebted to the Hawaiians.

The fact that "aloa" has been exploited for commercial purposes beclouds recognition of the more important and the more enduring meaning of that word.

The fact that it has very valuable commercial significance cannot be denied, however. Our tourist industry would not have the potential that it has without our Hawaiian spirit aloha.

This same spirit also underlies Hawaii's future as a center of friendly cultural interchange with other Pacific countries.

So here again we find the Hawaiian heritage given new meaning in our life today and offering new hope that these islands can contribute to extension of friendship, understanding, and peace far beyond these shores.

In a world ideologically divided, and at a time when mankind is threatened with extinction, when there is universal yearning for answers to human relations, the friendship standards, tolerances and generosity which we have inherited from Hawaiians are of far more importance than ever before.

In country after country, we have witnessed repudiation of our foreign policy when that policy has been based solely on militarism, materials, and money, which are commonly and mistakenly identified abroad as the American way of life.

But when we have attempted, as we are doing through the Peace Corps, to understand other peoples and their problems and to help them on the basis of simple friendship on a people-to-people basis, we gain acceptance and understanding, and we are able to build for peace.

So, my point here is that even in the heady and complex atmosphere of foreign policy we are rediscovering something that Hawaii and the Hawaiians have known all along: You can't buy friendship.

Success in life—whether it is life in a taro patch or life in the United Nations—has no price tag, in terms of dollar value or cost or material wealth.

Now, having given recognition to the priceless heritage we enjoy from the Hawaiians, let's look at another side of the picture.

Let me be very frank about this. I sometimes question whether we are really benefiting our people of Hawaiian ancestry or the intercultural character of our community by our continued, and at times intensified, emphasis on Hawaiians as a racial group.

I am very proud to have associated with me in the new State administration several individuals of Hawaiian ancestry. I regard these individuals as persons of great competence and integrity.

These include William S. Richardson, the Lieutenant Governor; Kekoa Kaapu, one of my administrative assistants; Edwin Mookini, who I recently appointed as administrative assistant in the new and highly complex field of data processing; Kalpo Kauka, deputy director of the Department of Transportation.

Also, Val Umi Marciel, the State comptroller; William G. Among, director of social services; and Mrs. Edna Taufaasau, personnel director.

We associate with these individuals and work with them as individuals who have the

skills, experience, education and character we need in government service.

The State needs them. The community needs people of their talent. They are serving the community as a whole. They do not seek and do not receive special consideration because they are of Hawaiian ancestry.

They very competently meet the challenges of their positions and are secure in the recognition of their abilities.

While I believe in legislation which underlies the purpose and need for our Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, I think that program can be improved administratively and by linking the department's activities more closely with those of the executive.

We can and should develop a more meaningful contribution to our economy from this program.

I would like to point out, however, that when we stop to contemplate what has happened to the American Indian as a result of the paternalistic program of reservation and special treatment and special schools, we have a very sad record of accomplishment.

Paternalism and special protection have really done nothing more for the Indians than to provide them with what amounts to custodial care. The program has not inspired or motivated them, nor has it equipped them to become a real part of contemporary American life.

Moreover, overprotection has led to some cases of exploitation by the more opportunistic minded.

By contrast, the people of Hawaiian ancestry have in large measure adjusted their lives to changing conditions in the environment of these islands.

More important, though, is that they have in the past contributed leadership to change in the broad interest of the entire community and are doing so today, and will continue to do so in the future.

My suggestion is, therefore, that the Hawaiian societies and various organizations, which have such a rich and proud history of endeavor, should not be persuaded by temporary considerations to fall back into a defensive posture.

Answers to the problems facing the Hawaiians, in my judgment, are not so unique that they are to be found in reliance on special protection or paternalistic programs * * * or in self-pity.

Hawaiian societies will be best serving their respected members if their goals are broadened to look forward and outward for opportunities through which the talents Hawaiians have may find room for expression and fulfillment in the interests of the entire community.

We all owe much to the Hawaiians. These islands and the new State would indeed be poor and ordinary without the rich heritage Hawaiians have bestowed upon us and unselfishly shared with us all.

We will continue to move forward as a community and as a State only to the extent we continue to be motivated by the Hawaiian spirit of friendliness and dedication to the common good.

I thank you for this privilege of addressing you.

My best wishes for a most successful convention.

Mahalo.

Shaping the Big Stick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of

A2972

the Senate a very fine article on anti-trust in the Common Market, entitled "Shaping the Big Stick," which appeared in Newsweek magazine on April 29, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SHAPING THE BIG STICK

One of the most outspoken critics of bigness in American business flew to Brussels last week to take a look at what the European Common Market planned to do about bigness in European business. For Senator ESTES KEFAUVER and his six-man delegation, the tour was prompted by more than academic curiosity: ECM's year-old anticartel policy could eventually have a mighty influence on the ability of U.S. industry to compete in the six-nation area. Despite an attack of Asian flu which kept him in bed for 1 of his 4 days in Brussels, the Tennessee Democrat talked with some 60 ECM officials, lawyers, businessmen, and economists to find out just how the Common Market plans to deal with Europe's age-old tendency toward cartelization.

Those plans are, in fact, only beginning to take shape. The Common Market's anti-cartel division has strongly worded powers; most agreements in restraint of trade are banned. But the ability of its small, 40-man staff to back up trust-busting decisions is still untested; it could, for instance, levy fines of up to \$1 million, but as yet hasn't moved against any violators. Indeed, according to U.S. observers, European policy is roughly where it was in the United States before Theodore Roosevelt started brandishing his big stick at big business.

Hans von der Groeben, of Germany, the Common Market's anticartel commissioner, quickly pointed out that the ECM does not oppose bigness per se. "In many cases," he said, "we favor mergers." But, he added, "we must proceed on several fronts at the same time." His point: The Common Market wants to encourage the industrial bigness needed to supply the growing mass market of its members but it must also prevent abuses that might stem from bigness.

PRECEDENT SETTERS

Of some 40,000 complaints and requests for exemption brought so far (largely by companies and individuals), only 1 has been decided by the ECM's High Court of Justice. In a dispute over exclusive franchises, it established the principle that the ECM's anti-cartel regulations automatically override the laws of the individual member states.

Another key case now on the docket involves Gründig, a big German radio and tape-recorder firm. In 1958, Henri Keller, a Parisian who sold bridal trousseaux door to door, started to import electrical appliances because the advent of the Common Market allowed him to buy such products in their country of origin and sell them at reduced prices in France. ("I do not consider myself an importer but a wholesaler of European goods," he said.) Authorized French distributors of the appliances haled Keller into court in an effort to halt his operations. After contradictory decisions in the French courts, the matter went to the ECM antitrust section. A favorable judgment for Keller would mean, in effect, that exclusive dealership arrangements cannot be enforced beyond national boundaries.

To keep abreast of such developments, five American law firms have specialists stationed full time in Brussels. They have already concluded that the United States might actually benefit from the anticartel movement, which could well ban existing discrimination against U.S. imports by nations

of the Six. Senator KEFAUVER agrees. "We're delighted to see the determined start that has been made here," he says. "It's much to the good for the free world and for businessmen on both sides of the Atlantic." And the Senator, who intends to hold hearings on the long-range ramifications of the ECM anti-cartel policy after he returns to the United States, adds that "we in the States have much to learn from the experiment that is going on here. And perhaps the officials of the Common Market can find some use in studying our methods [which are] based on a much longer experience in the antitrust field."

Ronald Reagan Speaks Out on Protecting Our Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 29, 1963, Mr. Ronald Reagan spoke to a large crowd attending the honors day activities in the gymnasium at Dixon High School which is located in my district. Reagan is a graduate of Dixon High.

The Dixon Evening Telegraph gave complete coverage to Reagan's remarks and covered his entire lecture in four installments beginning with the May 1, 1963, issue. Under unanimous consent, I include the first article in today's Record. I will insert the following articles during the next 3 days we are in session.

I commend Mr. Reagan's very timely and stimulating remarks to the attention of my colleagues. The first installment follows:

WHAT PRICE FREEDOM?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the first portion of a four-part installment on the lecture, "What Price Freedom?" given by Ronald Reagan, Monday, in Dixon.)

(By Ronald Reagan)

Early in this century a President who served in a time of easygoing, no crisis to underline his name in history, revealed something of the gift of prophecy. He said, "A revolution is taking place which will leave the people dependent on Government. Finding markets will develop into fixing prices and finding employment. Next step will be to furnish markets and employment or in default pay a bounty or dole. Those who look with apprehension on these tendencies do not lack humanity but are influenced by the belief that the result of such measures will be to deprive the people of character and liberty."

Today those who "look with apprehension on these tendencies" are not only charged with "lacking humanity" but are, more often than not, assailed as reactionaries and rightwing extremists. Many people of good will stand confused in the highly emotional atmosphere which colors the exchange of charge and countercharge.

The world today is faced with a choice between totalitarianism and freedom. All of us are conscious of the threat of the bomb. Speaking for the enemy Lenin said, "If it should become necessary to kill three-fourths of all the people in the world it would be worth it if the remaining one-fourth were Communist." This kind of threat is easy to understand. Not so simple

is the relating of our domestic difference to the world struggle.

We have come to a time for choosing and we should recognize that two contrary philosophies divide us. Either we believe in our traditional system of individual freedom with constitutional limits on the power of government, or we abandon the American Revolution and confess that an intellectual elite in some far distant capital can plan for us better than we can plan for ourselves.

Asked how long our Republic would endure, James Russell Lowell, when Minister to England replied, "It will last just so long as the people retain the ideas of the men who created that Republic." What were those ideas? Very simply—you and I have God given rights, among them freedom and the ability to determine our own destiny. Government's only excuse for being is to see that no individual or group in our midst and no outside aggressor can take this freedom from us. Government is a watchdog, not a cow to be milked.

There have only been a few moments of freedom in all man's history and most of those moments have been ours. But freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction. We can pass it on to our children only if we are determined to defend it and cherish it. The late Judge Learned Hand said, "Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women. When it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it."

From our Nation's beginning we have been warned that freedom can be lost inadvertently by our own acts. A more recent warning was voiced by Nikita Khrushchev when he told the Rumanian railway workers, "I am convinced that tomorrow the red flag will fly over the United States, but we will not fly the flag. It will be the Americans themselves."

Today under the unrelenting pressure of the cold war there is a widespread belief that all the problems of human need can be solved by Government. We are told that our traditional system of individual liberty is incapable of solving the complex problems of the 20th century, we must have a Government-controlled and planned economy. Howard K. Smith (rather prominent lately for TV activities), has written, "The market mechanism and the profit motives have outlived their usefulness. . . . The distribution of goods must be effected by a planned economy. The profit motive must be replaced by the incentives of the welfare state."

A U.S. Senator has said, "The Soviet experiment in socialism is no more radical for these times than was the American Declaration of Independence in the time of George III." And White House Adviser Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., writes, "There seems to be no inherent obstacle to the gradual advance of socialism in the United States, through a series of new deals. . . . He sees the cold war disappearing, "through a peaceful transition into a not undemocratic socialism." In other words, we will not stand firm for a choice between our free system and communism but will move to the left and the Communists, losing their fear and mistrust, will come to the right.

What this really means is that we tell a billion of our fellow humans now enslaved behind the Iron Curtain, to give up their hopes of freedom because we've decided to get along with their slave masters.

What of this choice they would offer us as a means of escaping the bomb? True, the Socialists are enemies of the men in the Kremlin—but only because they believe these ruthless men have brutally perverted the teachings of Karl Marx. The Socialists themselves are still dedicated to the abolition of private property, the free economy—indeed, freedom itself as we have known it. And they are not unaware of the tide run-